

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 22 July, 1980

Time — 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . . Oral Questions . . .

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can find out who the Acting House Leader is. What I am trying to do, maybe whoever knows can answer — this afternoon I think that he mentioned that we would not be going to Committee, we would go on 86, 96 and then maybe 48, is that it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe I have a list here: Bills 86, 96, 48, 112, 113, 114, 115.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day — the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. ED MCGILL (Brandon West): I was about to respond to the Member for St. Boniface and he has related it essentially as was the plan of the government in respect to the business of the House tonight. We will continue to deal with Bill 86, and we hope that all members will have an opportunity to present their views on that legislation or proposed legislation, following which we will call Bill 96 and then, as time permits, Bill 48 and so on.

Tomorrow we will meet in the House at 10:00 and then if Bill 86 has been completed we will meet in two committees in the afternoon and again in the evening if it is necessary to complete the business of those committees.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

**ADJOURNED DEBATES
ON SECOND READING**

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At 5:30, when it was adjournment hour, I was indicating I felt that based on the Minister's remarks, that rather than bringing in stability to the industry the Minister, I believe, by presenting this legislation, is on

the way to bring about instability in the industry, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister in his remarks, in his few short remarks, indicated, and he looked at the situation in other provinces, where he indicated that other provinces do not impose any control over the retail price. From those remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this government is proposing to lift the ceiling off the retail and the wholesale end and continue to control the producer prices on the basis of a formula that they will establish.

Mr. Speaker, the key, I believe, to this legislation, is for the Minister to provide reasons why they are getting rid of the Milk Control Board. The questions that I raised previously: What is the need for the legislation? What couldn't they have accomplished under the present Act that they hope to accomplish now, Mr. Speaker? While they are deregulating the retail and the wholesale end of the industry, the arguments that producers have put forward as saying, look, you are imposing on us another board, has some credibility, Mr. Chairman. The producers, of course, would like to have some input into the price-setting mechanism, meaning the formula, and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister should be prepared, I believe, to indicate why he is decontrolling the retail industry and still will maintain a control on the producers.

Mr. Speaker, while members on this side, while I on this side, have told the Minister and have given him options that are available to him in terms of the present structure, is that there is no argument from members on this side that there cannot and should not be a formula to establish the cost of production, that hearings be held only when there is a necessity to change the formula, and that price increases or decreases be passed through, Mr. Chairman, as they arise, or if prices decline as they arise, without the necessity of a hearing. We have certainly, members on side, not opposed that move, but that, Mr. Speaker, could have been accomplished by the present legislation, and by the present board, Mr. Speaker. But no, it appears that the Minister has allowed the pressure to build up over the last several years as to —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day, who have been in power practically three years, could have in the last three years, if they saw many of the problems.

We haven't heard from the Minister what he conceives the problems to be. If it is the length of time of the hearings, we have discussed that. We have had no difficulties there. If it is the cost of production formula that should be established, we have indicated we have had no difficulty with that. But, Mr. Speaker, what we do have difficulty with is the end price that consumers will pay, Mr. Speaker. That is where we have found difficulty in this legislation, and by the Minister's own words, the direction that he proposes to take the dairy industry in this province is to deregulate the wholesale and retail prices of milk; notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, that the bill does permit them to set prices.

Mr. Speaker, I can just hear the Minister getting up and giving us a spiel. He will say to you, look at the

present legislation, and look at this legislation, the powers are basically the same, or very similar, in the two pieces of legislation of what the boards can do. Then the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, why is the government amending and changing the legislation? That's really the question. Then, if the powers are similar, the Minister gets up and uses that argument, and will say, you know in the present Act, the Milk Control Board may set the prices. Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, why are you changing the bill? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that in the past year my department has had correspondence and consultation with consumers. Whom from the Consumers Association has the Minister consulted with? I'd like to hear from the Minister as to what input the Consumers Association had. Mr. Speaker, who has the Minister allowed and consulted with in terms of the processors, Mr. Speaker? Have the processors asked the Minister to be deregulated, Mr. Speaker? The Minister says no, the processors haven't asked to be deregulated. Mr. Speaker, the producers have asked to have changes, no doubt about that, in terms of the hearing process and that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could have accomplished in the present legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is the Minister's statement in presenting this bill to the House, which really has members on this side and myself very much concerned as to the direction that government is taking with respect to the legislation. We have had the Member for River Heights indicating today that he wishes there will be price cutting and there will be some price reductions in the price of milk, Mr. Speaker. The Member for River Heights should remember that it was several years ago that the legislation was passed to allow the board the freedom of not regulating minimum prices; the board was set free to allow minimum prices to fluctuate. All that was set was the maximum price, Mr. Speaker, and the board has been doing that for a number of years, so that the end price to the consumer is protected. The maximum price is set based on the information provided by: No. 1, the producers in their submissions; No. 2, in terms of the financial statements of the wholesalers and the retailers, Mr. Speaker, and that's how the price was set. But to indicate now that it is not possible under the present board and the present Act —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Speaker, the member says he didn't say that. He certainly indicated and implied in his statement that that's what he could see. That is permissible under the present terms of reference to the board.

But it appears, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister himself wishes to — and I've said this before — to give the impression to the producers of this province that, look, that Milk Control Board was a bad thing for you, they are no good, we will get rid of them, and this is one way of doing it. And we will what? We will bring in another board. We will bring in another board who will set the cost of production formula — and where do the producers go, Mr. Speaker? It's as if they are going from the devil to the deep blue sea. They're in between, they don't know where they're going. Government hasn't indicated. They've closed down one board and they've set up another. Mr. Speaker, if they wanted to change the members of the Milk Control Board, he had three years; the Minister has been in power and has been in office for

three years. If he was not satisfied with the work of the Milk Control Board, he had three years in which to change the membership of the board, to put on the members that he thought could do a better job in terms of changing the situation and changing the method of hearings. Mr. Speaker, he could have done that.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister really could have accomplished all that without bringing a new piece of legislation, because the new legislation is really a con job and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will find and I would almost wager a bet with the Minister that he will find as much unhappiness with the producers of this province with respect to this legislation as he will find with the consumers in terms of his statements about this piece of legislation that no longer Manitoba retail prices should be controlled, Mr. Speaker. Because really that's his statement on the basis of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened —(Interjection)— yes, Mr. Speaker, it is. I think the Minister — I hope that members on the government side listen and maybe once or twice, if I make those statements, maybe they'll be prepared to move back from their earlier position in terms of this legislation and bring in something sensible, Mr. Speaker, something that can be accepted by not only the producers, but by all citizens of the province of Manitoba. That's the kind of legislation that certainly would be welcome, rather than having the Minister of Agriculture bringing in legislation which will ostensibly by his statements benefit the corporate sector in the province of Manitoba. His stand on Cargill Grain, Mr. Speaker, with respect to hog production, is well known as to where he stands in terms of production of hogs by the corporate sector of this province. We have the Minister of Consumer Affairs bringing in the legislation dealing with rent controls. The Minister of Consumer Affairs could be accused, Mr. Chairman, of not being called the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but the Minister responsible for profiteering in the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, he freed the speculators in land in terms of the rent controls and he will not be prepared . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would ask the honourable member to stick to the subject matter of the debate.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I was really merely drawing an analogy to what the government ministers are doing with respect to legislation this session.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates we were in office before and nothing has happened. Can the Minister — I hope, when he discusses whether or not he's had requests from the Milk Control Board to do — for funding to do studies into the cost of production formula — to set that up. Back, I would think probably maybe right at the beginning, right after their election, I am wondering whether he had not let things ride so that the pressure builds up, Mr. Speaker, so that he can take action and appear to be — at least appear to be the saviour and have the Conservative Party say, well look at the NDP opposition. They're opposed to you producers and they're not on your side. We are going to change the

legislation and the legislation that we bring in will help you.

Mr. Speaker, that's not the case and will not be bought. The Minister is replacing one board with another. That's really what is happening. The key, Mr. Speaker, to this legislation again will be, who will the Minister appoint to this board and how will the board use its discretion. I think everyone on both sides of this House will really want to know as to what the Minister intends. Mr. Speaker, all he has to do is transfer the names from the Milk Control Board to this board, and what have we got, Mr. Speaker? Virtually the very same thing and we have a brand new bill. We want to know what the government's intention is.

The Minister says, what are we yakking about, Mr. Speaker. What are we yakking about? The members on the government side should have read the Minister's statements. They are not very happy that the government, and rightly so, Mr. Speaker, is by the Minister's own words — will indicate that they will be setting a cost of production formula and they have indicated that they found that they have found that most provinces do not impose any control over the retail price, Mr. Speaker.

How can one draw any other conclusion from the Minister's statement that he will not deregulate the industry? And that's, in effect, what will happen, Mr. Speaker. That is, in effect, what will happen. The Minister's statements will bear that out. We will be anxiously awaiting what the Minister will have to tell us, even though, Mr. Speaker, he's had the opportunity to allay fears, Mr. Speaker, and to make some statements. He has them today since we moved the hoist of the bill. Has he taken advantage of this? No, Mr. Speaker, he hasn't taken advantage. He sent up the Minister of Government Services, who at least attempted to draw a little red flag and a little red herring in front of the honourable members on this side, saying that we have moved away from our principle and long-standing policy that we believe in orderly marketing. That was the thrust of the Minister of Government Services' remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that was what one could consider a real good red herring, not unlike the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, who really went out and said, look, producers should start going out in this province and building their own dairies; should start having milk processed in small dairies. Mr. Speaker, it was the Conservatives on that side who really fronted for the multinationals and prevented the producers of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to indicate to the Conservative member that it was they who fronted for the large, the multinational industries in this province and prevented the producers, the dairy producers of this province —(Interjection)— that's right, Crocus Foods, Mr. Speaker. The producers of this province would have had total control of the dairy industry in their own hands in the province of Manitoba. You are the people that have prevented that. In retrospect, Mr. Speaker, you will

see that the producers are saying, we really missed our chance . . .

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, all that the producers have to do is to look at the province to the west, where primarily in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, where the producers control approximately 75 percent of the industry, or maybe more, Mr. Speaker, while in Manitoba about the same amount is controlled by the multinationals and the large chains, Mr. Speaker, and in that province, the producers control the entire industry. Not only are they able to have the processing industry under their control, they are able to pass on long-term savings to the consumers of that province while retaining and getting as high an income as is possible for themselves, Mr. Speaker. But they have the handle in the entire industry, and what is happening in Manitoba? No, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives in the last number of years were the ones who attacked the former government's approach to the option of having the producers take full control and having their own co-operative in the milk processing industry in this province. They are the ones who bucked it, Mr. Speaker, on the front, that really the co-operatives of Manitoba were the ones that were going to get hurt, that the little ones were going to get hurt. That was the thrust of the Conservatives. It wasn't the little ones that they were arguing about, Mr. Speaker. They were arguing for Beatrice Foods and the Safeways of this province, Mr. Speaker, that's what they were arguing, and they were using the small processors as their front, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the producers, I'm sure, see that had they made that move a number of years ago, that they would have had, not only the stability that the Minister says he wants, they would had the entire industry, I believe, in the long-term, and they would have brought about stability. But what we will see, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be chaos in the dairy industry. The consumers of this province will be subjected, and unless the Minister is prepared to at least have hearings on the retail price of milk and not deregulate the price, and bring in the formula, which nobody argues about, for the producers, but all he is doing, Mr. Speaker, is really replacing one board with another.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reason why we have opposed this bill is quite evident. It is the Minister's statements, very unclear as to what will happen and, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to what the Minister has to say to us as to how he intends to handle this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTION put, MOTION defeated.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House is the amendment moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that The Milk Prices Review Act be not now read a second time, but read this date six months hence.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Miller, Parasiuk, Schroeder, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding, Mrs. Westbury.

NAYS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Minaker, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21, Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

We're now dealing with the main Motion. The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on Bill No. 86, I would like to thank the members of the opposition for their input into the debate. Also, I would like to thank the members of the government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, for their support — their support, Mr. Speaker, in what I believe is a very responsible move on their behalf in supporting the government to develop a pricing system for the dairy producers in this province, a system which, Mr. Speaker, is very fair for the consumers of the province and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by saying I don't think there is any question about any member of this side of House, any member of the other side of the House, in their desire to provide a top quality product for the consumers of milk, for the low income people, for the old people, for those people who are unable to support themselves, but in fact I believe there's a common understanding that we would all like to see those people be able to have milk.

I think that's really the main objective of both sides and it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some misleading take place from members of the other side of the House, that in fact I put myself as the Minister of Agriculture, in preparing this legislation, Mr. Speaker, in the position of being a consumer, a consumer in the province, a consumer of a product which is essential to everyone and I think the dairy producers of the province feel the same way — that they, Mr. Speaker, do not want an unfair piece of legislation that would allow them to take advantage of anyone in society. In fact, far from it, Mr. Speaker. I think all they are requesting, as I'm requesting for them, is an opportunity to be paid for their efforts. No different, Mr. Speaker, than a party, such as the party on the other side of the House who, Mr. Speaker, who are strong supporters of

labour legislation, Mr. Speaker, that does what? Mr. Speaker, give the people who are working an upper-hand on the rest of society, so they can demand increases when it comes to working for the rest of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the dairy farmers want that. All they are asking for, Mr. Speaker, is a fair and equal opportunity to have legislation that's in place, that will allow them to be paid for their efforts, the efforts that they put into the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, we have not only moved in legislation to allow the milk pricing to change on a fair and equitable basis, at the same time providing the consumer a product that we're all in need of, and giving them the ability, Mr. Speaker, to, if they're not happy, Mr. Speaker, with the price of that milk, that there is an opportunity to put their case forward, Mr. Speaker, to a commission, a separate commission which is in place, which, Mr. Speaker, will give the consumers, and I want everyone to know this, will give the consumers an opportunity that they now don't have under the present Milk Control Board. Mr. Speaker, any consumer, if he's not satisfied with the price of retail milk, on an ongoing basis, can have that milk price reviewed, Mr. Speaker. But under the present legislation, Mr. Speaker, they don't have that opportunity. No, Mr. Speaker, they don't have that opportunity, they have to wait until an appeal or a hearing is heard. But on an ongoing basis, Mr. Speaker, the consumers have the opportunity to be heard on the price of milk.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East is going to have a lot of difficulty; when he goes into Brandon East, of course, he doesn't really know what it takes to produce milk. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, he is one of the economists in this country that thinks that if you can figure it out with his kind of arithmetic, then it will happen. Well, Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of hard work from the dairy industry to put milk on the table of the people of the province, and we want to ensure that that takes place.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that before introducing this legislation, there have been a lot of steps taken by the government of Manitoba, by the Premier, by the rest of his Cabinet and the caucus, Mr. Speaker, to put in place programs that will assure those unfortunate people that they are able to afford milk. Look at the programs in the White Paper reforms on tax, that anyone that is under a certain income can give 30 — just stop — laugh if you like — but 30 per child, Mr. Speaker, will buy the milk supply for that one child for one month. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's time that we just stop and put everything into perspective. It isn't the low-income people, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite are worried about, it is those members on the other side who think it's going to cost them a nickel more to buy milk. When I speak about a nickel, I really should refer individually to each of the member's comments, Mr. Speaker, as they spoke to the bill.

I should really mention that when the Member for Burrows, who has left — I have a little farm story I should tell about the Member for Burrows, when he speaks to the Milk Control legislation about 1932 — well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see that he's back in. The Member for Burrows refers to legislation in 1932 that was put in place by the government of the day to take some chaos out of the dairy industry. Mr.

Speaker, at that particular time, that was the only form of legislative protection that the dairy industry had, that the consumers had and the producers had.

The Member for Inkster brought us up on some more history that, in fact, the legislation was not put in place at that particular time to protect the consumers, but was in fact put in place to protect the producers. Well, since that particular time, we have seen a lot of changes take place in the industry. We've seen the producers modernized; they have put in new production equipment, Mr. Speaker; they've put in a lot of equipment that has facilitated the increased efficiencies that have been needed in the industry. But, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Burrows speaks of 1932, he doesn't tell the whole story, because the reason that the Milk Control Board was put in was to try and regulate the supply of milk to make sure that everyone had a supply.

Since that time, we now have a producer board which, in fact, has the power given to them under the last government, under the NDP Party, to cover the cost of 50 percent of the milk. They have that authority already. We now have two mechanisms in place in the province to price milk. The milk comes into town on the same truck, the same cows produce it but, Mr. Speaker, we have two mechanisms in place to price milk. What are the dairy farmers asking, Mr. Speaker? They're asking to have the ability to price all of their milk, which the Member for Lakeside referred to earlier. That is the philosophy of the NDP Party. They believe that should take place, but they're standing up, debating against it. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they want the votes of the consumer. They don't care if the consumers have milk, Mr. Speaker, they don't care about the young children, because if they did care they would be supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let them stand up 10 years from now, when we are practically out of milk, and tell the people that are running the nursing homes, tell the people that are running the hospitals that we can't supply them with milk because we didn't facilitate the increase in price so the producers could get enough. No, Mr. Speaker, they were prepared to sit on their haunches. Other provinces have moved to modernize the pricing system for their producers. They have modernized so that they can assure their consumers of a fair and adequate supply of milk. We are the most over-regulated dairy industry in all of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and we're moving to change that so that we are responsible to the people who are producing and consuming it.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet uses the example of B.C. He says we should look at what it's costing B.C., land at 4,000 an acre. He's comparing apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker, because why aren't we talking about Saskatchewan, the province next door to us? Why aren't we talking about Ontario, where they have in place, systems that are facilitating the actual objectives that we're working on, but no, Mr. Speaker, he tries to bring in red herrings. At the same time he's trying to tell us that this legislation is going to figure in, is going to say that there is actually a right given to the producers to produce milk, that they are now going to pay for the right to produce milk. That has nothing to do with the Milk Control Board at all, Mr. Speaker. Nothing to do with it at all. It's a total red herring, that he's trying to

mislead the public, in saying that there is a cost to the right to produce in there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to put the record straight, that there will be no right to produce figured into the cost of production formula. There is no cost of production, or there is no right to produce cost figured in to —(Interjection)— well Mr. Speaker, they don't know, and it hasn't changed any since they were in power. The old Act doesn't point that out, Mr. Speaker, and they're sitting here trying to say the new Act should spell it out. Well, why didn't they have the intestinal fortitude to change the old Act then, Mr. Speaker, if they're so worried about it?

Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about production rights and who should have figured in the legislative power or the returns from legislative power given to any group, we should talk about the rights given to the labour movement in this country. Mr. Speaker, the labour movement in this country has been given the right to strike, to have their wages increased. Mr. Speaker, for what purpose? To get a better standard of living. They want to be able to say to us that the dairy farmer shouldn't be able to build in to their cost of production, the right that was given through the legislative process, into the cost of production.

And I agree with the Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Member for Inkster when he says that a legislative right that gives value to produce something shouldn't be built in to the cost of production and, Mr. Speaker, I agree with that principle. I do not agree that that should be built in. The same as I do not agree that it should be built into the cost of what it costs the farmer to buy a milking machine or a combine or a tractor. When the legislative power has been given to a group of people to withhold their services to the rest of society, Mr. Speaker, it is so. Yes, when they are able to use the legislative power to demand on the rest of society that they have to be paid more money — to do what? Not to produce more, not for more production, Mr. Speaker, just because they need more. (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question following my closing of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is as fair for the dairy producers as it is for the labour movement, but I don't support either one. I don't think a legislative right should be figured into the value, and I agree with what he is saying on that principle. And if you want to carry it to the full distance, then in fact, the dairy farmers should be asking to have a commission set up, Mr. Speaker, that reviews the cost of increase to the products that they are buying because of the fact that the labour have increased the cost of the goods that they are buying, and it should be reviewed to see if that is fair and equitable.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to come right down to basics when we are debating this bill. When we are talking about legislative rights given to a group of people, that can't be figured into the cost of production, then I think it has to cut straight across-the-board and, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the Member for Inkster would reconsider his position when he comes to supporting or not supporting this bill.

I would like to speak a little more to some of the other points that I have here on Bill 86, and I'll go back to the comments that the Member for Burrows

made. He goes back to the Milk Control Board of 1932 that was put in place because there were no other mechanisms in place, and it was in fact to protect, not the consumer, but the producer. But as time has evolved and we have seen developments in the industry, we have seen some changes take place. The producers have now a board in place to protect their interests and, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen the Control Board develop into is a consumer control mechanism, which we have all agreed that it is essential that somebody give protection to the consumers to assure that they in fact have got input into the milk price that they have to pay.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk of the Milk Control Board of 1980. The Milk Control Board, Mr. Speaker, of which he was a Cabinet Minister that appointed them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he was one of the Cabinet Ministers who was part of appointing the Milk Control Board that is now in place. And what did they recommend, Mr. Speaker? What did they recommend? Now, I really have to say I can't make apologies for the Member for Burrows, but he reminds me somewhat of an old farm dog we used to have. — (Interjection)— No, no reflection on the Member for Burrows. I give the dog a little more credit, Mr. Speaker, because the old farm dog — (Interjection)— No, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, the dog knew the difference between sick him and come here. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Burrows, I really don't think he knows what he is talking about when he is talking about the 1932 Milk Control Board, when he put a Board in place that recommended these kinds of changes taking place that we are proposing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Milk Control Board recommended that a formula be put in place that triggered automatically, that we didn't have to go through the public appeal process. Mr. Speaker, they are telling me that, and, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing. He wanted to know why we are changing it? Because the Milk Control Board asked for it, recommended it, which they appointed, Mr. Speaker. The dairy farmers of the province asked for a change and, Mr. Speaker, we are moving in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving in that direction and at the same time giving the consumers of this province a guarantee that they will have an opportunity to have input into the control of the retail price of milk.

Mr. Speaker, we are going on the recommendations of the Milk Control Board that was put in place by the members opposite. We are following along the lines of their recommendation, not 1932 like the Member for Burrows would like to take us back, Mr. Speaker. I really can't figure out what the relevance of his argument was, he was really not in tune with the times.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that we are moving in that direction and in fact I think that we are going a little further as far as the consumers are concerned, because they do have an ongoing input to the price of milk, and I want that to be put on the record and the consumers of this province to know we are protecting the interests of the consuming public.

Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the sections of the bill specifically because I think that it is important that everyone in the province and the media know so

they can communicate it to it. And the commission, that's Part 3(5) of the Act, and it says the commission shall monitor the price of fluid milk charged by distributors and retailers and where the commission deems those prices to be unreasonable, the commission may by order establish schedules of maximum prices and minimum prices or both at which fluid milk may be sold to the consumers. Mr. Speaker, their power it there, the same power as they have today, Mr. Speaker, the same power as they have today.

I am somewhat surprised by the comments by the Member for Fort Rouge, because her requesting to have this bill withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised, because there are some good Liberal, good strong Liberal dairy farmers in the province. But maybe if she isn't getting any calls, maybe it shouldn't be of any surprise, because maybe those calls are now coming into the Conservative Caucus Room.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is government's responsibility, it is government's responsibility to keep in place legislation that keeps a proper balance, that it shouldn't be weighted to the consumers, it should be weighted to the producers, but it should be fair and equitable, Mr. Speaker. That is the objective.

We have heard, Mr. Speaker, members opposite say, well, you could have changed the board, you could have changed the board, Mr. Speaker. Changed the board for what purpose. They should have been fair people and I am sure they are, that's why they weren't changed. Is that what they did, Mr. Speaker, because they didn't agree with what was happening, instead of taking a hold of the issue? No, Mr. Speaker, they didn't. They would change the board to lean to the left the way they were, Mr. Speaker, and I could name many examples, but I don't think we have to. I think the general farm public know really what took place under the last government. — (Interjection)— Why didn't we change the board, Mr. Speaker? Because we felt they were fair and equitable. Look what they are recommending to us, Mr. Speaker. They are recommending exactly what we are doing.

They have stood up, Mr. Speaker, and given us what I would consider a lot of debate that has created a lot of heat, but very little light. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is in the best interests of both the consumers and the producers that we should sit and not act.

Mr. Speaker, we talked of politics of the Milk Control Board. Any time you deal with an important product like milk, it could have political ramifications, Mr. Speaker. We have heard members of this side of the House stand up and speak, Mr. Speaker, in support of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, they haven't been afraid to come to grips with the issue, because they know what the downroad difficulties will be if we don't. Mr. Speaker, they will have to answer to the public for being short of milk. They don't want that resting on their doorstep.

Mr. Speaker, let us just stop and be a total consumer for a few minutes, today as opposed to a few years ago. The Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Public Works, suggested earlier today that the percentage of the consuming public, the money that a person spends today towards food has

been decreasing something like 16 percent, it is about 14 percent is spent in the home and about another four percent spent out at restaurants and that, and that type of eating. So we have had about 18 percent of the consumer's dollar going towards food.

Mr. Speaker, not too many years ago it took about half-an-hour of a man's pay or woman's pay to earn one quart or one litre of milk. Today, Mr. Speaker, if you take the minimum wage and you work it down to what it costs to buy a litre of milk, it takes about 10 minutes to 15 minutes of a person's daily wages to buy a litre of milk. A family of four, Mr. Speaker, about 20 minutes of a person's pay would buy them their daily needs for milk. Pretty small, Mr. Speaker, when you sit and look at it in those terms. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what works down to is that a man or a woman in their normal coffee break time can earn enough money to buy their daily milk requirements, the coffee break time of any person can make enough money to buy their daily milk requirements. Mr. Speaker, that was not the case ten years ago. Mr. Speaker, when you figure it out —(Interjection)— I said, Mr. Speaker, two litres a day for about 20 minutes, about 62 cents for a litre of milk is 1.24, 3.15 is the minimum wage and if you figure it back, Mr. Speaker, about 20 minutes is what I said, the normal coffee break. Mr. Speaker, that is the length of time it takes to get your daily milk requirements for a family of four.

Mr. Speaker, do you know how long a dairy farmer has to work to make that kind of money? Mr. Speaker, they have to work 25 hours a day, 365 days of the year, Mr. Speaker. Their work is never done. Their work is never done, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that No. 1, we are all concerned that the people who are unable to provide for themselves get milk. Mr. Speaker, there isn't anyone on this side of the House or any dairy farmer that begrudges anyone that kind of product or that necessity. We will all assure that, and I am sure my colleagues on this side of the House will back us 100 percent. There is no question on that. —(Interjection)— That's right, Mr. Speaker. My colleague from Rock Lake says, don't ask the producers to carry that load on their back and, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why we are changing the Act.

I would just like to further add, Mr. Speaker, that some of the other parts of the Act that are in to make sure that the consumers are well protected — and I want to emphasize this and this is the considerations and fixing the maximum prices and the minimum prices. We heard comments earlier today about the fact that why not put a maximum price in place. Why isn't it working, because a maximum price will give people protection. Mr. Speaker, it hasn't been working.

Mr. Speaker, it hasn't been working, because the minute you put a maximum price in place it becomes the floor price; Mr. Speaker, the only price. It hasn't worked, Mr. Speaker. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have also had comments from the Milk Control Board, the same Milk Control Board that was put in place from the members opposite — and I will quote one line from their comments. "The board is of the opinion that insufficient competition among

processors prevails." The Member for Fort Rouge stood up and said it was to protect the processors.

Mr. Speaker, all the presentations we have had, or the majority of presentations we have had, is not from the processors. They are happy with the system, Mr. Speaker, because they have a locked in profit. They haven't had to compete, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite were protecting the segment of the industry that least need the protection, and they have the audacity to stand up and say that we have something going with the processors of this province. Mr. Speaker, very much the opposite. The processors like the system that's in place. The producers don't like it, Mr. Speaker, because it isn't giving them a fair and equitable return.

Let me just further read into the record, Mr. Speaker, the protection that we are giving the consumers and, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the consumers because I have a lot of members here that are my colleagues that represent consumers far better than the member from whatever it is over there and sitting in the back row. What is the name of that — Wellington, Mr. Speaker — who lets on that he is representative of the consumers, just about the same kind of representation as he considers the farmers' union that represents the farm community, Mr. Speaker. He reads to us as if the farm union represents the farm community. Mr. Speaker, there are less than 800 farmers in the Farm Union Movement, out of 20 to 30 thousand farmers in Manitoba. That's a pretty small representation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just read further for the consumer's benefit. "Considerations in fixing maximum prices and minimum prices" and this 3/6th's of the act, "in establishing minimum or maximum prices or both under subsection 5, the commission shall take into account the cost of milk to the distributor or processor as determined by a formula. By the formula established under subsection 3(2), the cost of processing, handling, packaging, and distributing the milk, the allocation of direct and overhead costs of fluid milk and other products and costs of retailing; and (b) The need to provide consumers with a continuous supply of fluid milk at reasonable prices, and may establish such prices in respect of any quantity of fluid milk and express those prices in relation to the fluid measure or butter fat content or otherwise."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe when we are discussing and debating a bill in principle, we are not supposed to refer to sections. Here we have the Minister, who should know better, reading it word for word, paragraph by paragraph. I think he should be told that this is not the common practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister, and the comments of the Honourable Member for Kildonan are quite correct. I would hope the honourable member would talk about the principle.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and thank you for that directive. I will try and refrain from referring directly to the actual facts as they prevail, Mr. Speaker.

I, Mr. Speaker, would like to just make a brief comment for the Member for Churchill who is concerned about the consumers of milk in Churchill. Mr. Speaker, the Act does give consideration for the remote areas of the province. Mr. Speaker, if any particular price is out of line or there appears to be some unfair pricing mechanism or practice that's taking place, the commission do have the ability to establish the price in that remote community, Mr. Speaker. They can direct and set the price and will direct and set the price in that particular community, Mr. Speaker. That is in the Act, no different than it is today, Mr. Speaker. The same controls are there.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we should really acknowledge the Member for Ste. Rose, who has on the record said that there have been very little changes in the Act that we've proposed. Mr. Speaker, they've done a lot of debating. The Leader of the Opposition has put a hoist on the bill; for what purpose if in fact they are happy with the bill that's in place and members are saying that there is very little change? There are some basic changes, Mr. Speaker, but they have failed to point them out to the consumers of this province. They failed to point them out to the producers of this province but, Mr. Speaker, I think the producers know what the basic changes are. Mr. Speaker, we will further hear from people who are concerned when we go to committee. I am sure that there have been some positive comments come from members opposite that I am sure should be taken into consideration and we will have the opportunity —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for La Verendrye says we should be easy on that. That, Mr. Speaker, will be given consideration when we go into the committee.

I think that it is a process that we feel was necessary as a government, Mr. Speaker, not to discriminate against the consumers, not to put the farmers at an advantage to them, but give them the fair and equitable opportunity that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members from this side of the House, and I want to thank the members opposite for their productive input into the debate and look forward to further debating it and hearing the submissions of the committee and recommend that the members of the House support Bill No. 86.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister has said that he would answer a question after he concluded his remarks. In his remarks he said that workers had been given the right by legislation to withdraw their services for the purpose of seeking greater wages. Mr. Speaker, that is false, but I don't want to argue it now, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell me which group in society without legislation does not now have the right to withdraw their services to seek better pay for what they are selling, whether it be grain producers, milk producers, turkey producers, doctors, lawyers, anybody else with the one exception where it has been legislatively taken away, that is teachers and firefighters?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, let us just go back to a statement that the honourable member made earlier and I missed it in my debate and if I can just cover it in my answer — he suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the first labour legislation in fact put a maximum on the price of what people could earn as wage earners, which, Mr. Speaker, he didn't like; the wage earners didn't like; but Mr. Speaker, that is the same kind of legislation that the members opposite think should be left on the dairy producers in this province, that there should be a maximum put on what they can get for their product. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member gave me an opportunity to change it.

Mr. Speaker, the dairy producers of this province feel that the production of milk is an essential commodity. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that they would take advantage of the rest of society to the betterment of their own industry. Mr. Speaker, I believe that they feel it is an essential service and they don't need a law, Mr. Speaker, to tell them that they can do that.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I wonder if the Minister would point out which group in society, whether it be turkey producers, wheat producers, grain producers, flax producers, milk producers, any producer of any agricultural commodity, which of them does not have the legislative right to say that they will not grow the product, they will not produce it, and they will not sell it, because they are not satisfied with the price.

Mr. Speaker, will the member also confirm that milk producers in the United States and Canada at different times have spilled milk rather than sell it for a price that they don't want, which I say they have the right to do and I would defend their right to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The motion before the House is Bill No. 86 be now read a second time.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. FOX: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House, shall Bill No. 86, Milk Prices Review Act, be now read a second time.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McGill, McKenzie, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, and Steen.

NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Parasiuk, Schroeder, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding, and Mrs. Westbury.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26, Nays 23.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. McGill: Mr. Speaker, before you call Bill 96 I might confirm to the House that the Agricultural Committee will meet at 2:00 o'clock tomorrow in Room 254 to consider Bill 86. Should their work not be completed, they will meet again in the evening at 8:00 o'clock. The Private Bills' Committee will meet in Room 255 to continue their deliberations. In the unlikely event, Mr. Speaker, that both Committees should complete their work by 5:30, we might recall the House at 8:00 p.m., so members should remain in touch with the situation.

BILL NO. 96

THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether or not I will be the last to speak on this particular bill from this side of the House, but I do believe that it is a piece of legislation that has demanded, and justifiably so, the attention of this House, of all members on both sides of this House, and has been one worthy of a detailed analysis. Because in what seems to be a fairly complex piece of legislation that is intended obviously to deal with the whole matter of how political parties shall gain their financial backing, is in fact what I can only call a piece of monetary gerrymandering. You know, we had expected, and justifiably so, from experiences, perhaps some bias built into the different Acts that come before this House, and when you come to an Act that has such an impact on the activities, the political and election activities of the members of this House, one is even more fearful of that bias, the bias of the government in power being put into legislation. That is exactly what has happened with this particular piece of legislation. We have a bill that is

intended to benefit the Progressive Conservative Party, and it will by that fact also benefit the Liberal Party, I might add, although there are certain qualifications that have to be made to that statement, which I will delve into later. But the fact is that it is intended to benefit the two old-line parties with their two old-line sources of funding, and that is the corporations, and that will work to the disadvantage of the peoples' party, of a party that depends upon the individual, depends upon the citizen with a political motivation to fund their activities.

It is interesting that back during the session, the Member for St. Matthews announced to the press that he was going to bring forward sort of a mini-election finances act in regard to contributions that unions can make, and if I recall it properly — and if I am giving the story wrong I would ask the member to correct me — if I recall it properly what he said — and he was mad because a transit union had decided to delve into political activities; they had decided at a duly held meeting through a democratic process that they were going to delve into . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews on a . . .

MR. LEN DOMINO: I'm not quite sure what this is a point of, I think it's a point of clarification. I never ever stated that I was mad at the Transit Union for any of their actions, or that anything the transit union has ever done has in any way influenced my actions in this House or the proposals I was going to present to this House. So the member is wrong from the start.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: As you say, oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, in this House, that we do have differences of opinion, and I will accept the member's word, although the story that came to me through some fairly legitimate sources at the beginning substantiated what I had to say just a moment ago. Let's not impute motives to him. Let's not try to determine why it is he wanted to bring forward. Let's look at what the bill would have done.

His mini-election finances bill would have said that if a union wants to give a donation to a political party, that what they would have to do is have a survey every so often within their union, and they would have to determine how many people would vote for the Torys and how many people would vote for the New Democrats and how many people would vote for the Liberals and how many people would vote for the Socreds and how many people would vote for the Libertarians and how many people would vote for the Rhinoceros Party and how many people would vote for the Marxist Leninist Party and how many people would vote for the Communist Party and so on and so on, and then what they would have to do, the union would have to split that money up percentage-wise if they wanted to donate it. If they wanted to donate 1,000 a month, and 30 percent had said they were going to vote for the Liberals, they would have to give 300 to the Liberals, and if 70 percent had said they were going to vote for the

NDP they would have to give 700 to the NDP. I believe that is basically what he had suggested would be a proper restrictive mechanism to impose upon the unions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that when the honourable member is finished speaking, he may then rise and clarify his position. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Sir, I will be the first to admit that perhaps I have it wrong, because this is what the member told us he was going to do but never proceeded with, so we don't really know exactly what would have been strictly in that bill, but the fact is that this was the common perception that was going around at the time.

What that says to me, Mr. Speaker, is not that the Member for St. Matthews wants to see a more democratic election finances system, what it says to me is that he wants to restrict the political activities of the union. But it's interesting that at the same time he did not say, well, when a corporation wants to give money to a particular political party, what it must do is have a survey done of its shareholders and that its shareholders would have to split up the money in a percentage manner as he had suggested for the union.

Now what does that say to us? What that says to us, is that in the mind of the Member for St. Matthews, as my recollection of the events of a number of months ago, go, he believed that the unions and individuals who wished to give money to political parties should operate under different rules than the corporations. I don't believe that the Member for St. Matthews has much influence in his caucus or within the Cabinet, but I do believe in this particular instance he must have had some influence, because what we have before us is an election finance act that is based upon much the same principle that restricts the activities of the unions in giving money to the political parties and leaves a free hand open to the corporations. And the restrictive mechanism of course, is the particular part of the bill that suggests that if a union is going to give more than 10 cents per member, that it must in fact start handing out receipts, which is a cumbersome process and a process that would undoubtedly restrict the activities of the union in donating to a political party of their choice.

Now there is a reason for the 10 cents per member per month qualification, that is, most unions when they affiliate to a political party, they give that party 10 cents a month per member. That's the standard donation that they would give to a political party. But in my own constituency I have a union that gives the 10 cents per month per member. On top of that, it gives a 50 a month lump sum. If this bill were to go forward, they would either have to drop that 50 a month lump sum, which may not sound like much to you, but in my constituency that's a lot of money for political purposes. They would have to drop that, or they would have to start receipting each individual member, and that indeed could be cumbersome and I would suggest that they would probably drop the 50 a month. They might try to find some other method to use that money for political activities, but

the fact is that they would be forced into not doing what they wished to do because of this type of legislation, yet a corporation can give whatever it wants and it doesn't have to receipt any of the shareholders. A corporation can give whatever it wants and it doesn't have to in any sort of substantive way check with the shareholders, and they in fact do, Mr. Speaker.

We are indeed fortunate to have before us the list of contributions which just came out from the federal government in regard to contributions made to political parties during the year 1979. Let's look at some of those contributions and where they come from. Let's start with the Member for St. Matthews' party, the Conservative Party, and let's see how the contributions within that party break down. There are seven classifications. They are individuals; (2) is public corporations; the next classification is private corporations; then governments; after that comes trade unions; then (6) is corporations without share capital other than trade unions; and (7) is unincorporated organizations other than trade unions. The Conservative Party got 60 percent of the 8,375,716 that is listed in this, of contributions of over 100. They got 5,020,285 of that from public and private corporations, 60 percent funded by public and private corporations, and only 38 percent funded by individuals within the party. We see now who rules the roost in the Conservative Party. It is the corporations. I will go into some more detail on that in a moment.

Now if they are bad in that regard, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are worse. If they are funded primarily by the corporations, the Liberals are funded almost totally by the corporations; three quarters, or 74 percent of their funding, of their 5,220,520, came from the corporations, Mr. Speaker, 74 percent — I would suggest that is an unhealthy balance — while 23 percent came from individuals. We see, if I were an individual in the Liberal Party I would be concerned that I didn't have much of a voice when it came to making policy, when it came to putting programs in place, and when it came to trying to direct my particular party. I would much rather be a corporation. Obviously they have far more monetary influence, and that in many instances reflects the policies of a government.

The New Democratic Party on the other hand had 42 percent of its donations come from individuals, close to one half, Mr. Speaker. And from corporations it had grand sum total of 3 percent — and I don't know how they got in there, but they got in there somehow. It was private corporations and public corporations. (Interjection)— The Member for Roblin says, Husky Oil and Tommy Douglas. Well perhaps if there is any good that can come out of Tommy Douglas sitting on Husky Oil board of directors, that might be one of the good points that can come out, I'm not certain. Mr. Douglas did not consult me before he chose to sit on that board and I have not consulted him afterwards, but I am certain that he had very good reasons for doing so, because he has very good reasons for almost everything he does. I intend to, when I have the opportunity, discuss that matter with him further.

But let's get back to the subject matter at hand; I don't want to be distracted by the Member for Roblin. — (Interjection)— Uh huh, the Member for St.

Matthews with his one-track mind, "Get the unions, get the unions, get the unions," says across the Chamber from his seat, "Give me the figures for the unions," Mr. Speaker. Well, I will. I will. The unions donated 1,701,616 for a total of 28 percent of our donations, 28 percent of our donations. Now, he is writing that down, because I know he wants to get into this debate and I know he wants to answer some of the suggestions that I have put on the record.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that those union donations for the most part come from affiliation dues, come from union meetings — I have been through a lot of these meetings, as a matter of fact I am very proud to go to these meetings when they are trying to decide in a democratic way whether or not they are going to affiliate, and by doing so fund the New Democratic Party. And I go to these meetings because, as a representative in this House, as a member of a political party which I think is reflective of the needs of the working person, of the individual in this society, I feel I have some contribution to make to those meetings. What I tell the people when I go to those meetings is, I want you to affiliate to the New Democratic Party for two reasons, for two reasons specifically, Mr. Speaker. The first reason is I want your input.

You see, we are a very democratic party; we hold conventions every year, unlike the Conservative Party. At these conventions we have our policy decisions made in a democratic way. We have a democratic structure and we pride ourselves in that. I want the unions to become involved, and when I talk about the unions, all I am talking about is people who work for a living. I want them to come to our conventions; I want them to become involved; I want them to be a part of the policy-making process so that we will have a party that more directly reflects the needs of the working person in this province and in this country. That is why I want them in there. But I also — if I can just finish the second point, Mr. Speaker, and I accept your admonition to get back to the bill.

The second point I tell them is I want their money, because if we don't get the money from the unions, and if we don't get the money from the individuals, we have to go to the corporations, because there is limited sources of funding in a society, and I don't want to be put in the position of having to go to the corporations. So that is why I am proud that the unions fund us 28 percent, and that is why — (Interjection)— In a democratic way, certainly. And that is why I am concerned that this bill will in some way influence their decision to fund us, at least above and beyond the 10-cent per member, and I think that that will hurt our party. I think this whole bill hurts our party, Mr. Speaker. I think this bill is intended to hurt the New Democratic Party. I think this bill is intended to hurt the New Democratic Party. I think this bill is intended to damage the New Democratic Party. I think it is, as the Member for Rossmere says, a vicious attempt to destroy the funding base of the New Democratic Party. What is that funding base? The people. They are not attacking us, they are attacking the average Manitoban; they are attacking the individual who wants to give money and wants to have that money play a part in the development of a political process.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I missed the comment from the Minister. The Minister said that I was phony, or the argument was phony? Would the Minister care to put that on the record? The Minister doesn't have the courage to put that on the record, Mr. Speaker. I have learned to accept his interruptions, and I have learned to accept his negativism, and I have learned to accept his inane comments, Mr. Speaker, but I will address myself to the bill and try not to get sidetracked by what appears to be a blatant attempt to deflect me from telling why we are opposed to this bill, which his government has brought in, which is an attack on the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, that while we receive 28 percent of our funding from the unions, each of those decisions to grant that funding is made in a democratic way, and when I go to these meetings I am always somewhat concerned that they are going to reject the affiliation. I am always somewhat concerned that they are going to reject contributing to the party, and on occasion, the very rare occasion, that does happen. It is happening less and less, but the fact is that they have that democratic choice, and when they make that choice I accept that choice; I come back again and try to convince them, but I do accept the choice. I accept the democratic will, and that is what the government doesn't want to talk about, that is what the Minister doesn't want to listen to. He doesn't want to listen to democracy, he doesn't want to listen to the democratic way, he would rather ramrod through a bill that is intended to take away financially the democratic rights of many of the citizens of this province, just as their Election Act will take away the voting rights of some of the members of this province.— (Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, now the Minister is saying that we have arranged it with our federal party. Well, I would rather have an arrangement between the provincial NDP and the federal NDP than the arrangement, the unholy marriage, that they have with the corporations, that the under-the-table arrangements that they have been historically known to make. I would much rather be arranged with a party, with people of my own philosophical bent, above-board, and if he knows about I am certain that all know about it. I would much prefer that to the type of arrangements that we have seen . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. We can only have one speaker on this bill at one time.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your assistance and guidance in this matter.

There are a number of other items that I wish to speak to on this bill, but I don't want to leave the area of funding and what it does to a political party until I have put a few matters on the record.

One is, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of elite groups, financially powerful groups that provide the Conservative Party with a substantial portion of their funding — and it is an arrangement, everybody knows about the arrangements that are made between the provincial government and the business community. You know, the mining industry, according to the federal results, and these are federal returns for the year 1979, the mining industry

in total contributed to the Progressive Conservative Party 215,725. They contributed to the Liberal Party, by the way, 187,140, 180,740, excuse me, I want to make certain that is on the record correctly. They contributed to the NDP nothing, so we are not beholden to them, Mr. Speaker, and I believe — (Interjection)—

Well, the Minister is still attempting to interject himself in the debate, and I really don't mind, because he allows me the opportunity to point out that it does make a difference. He says, "And that makes a difference?" in a question form, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it does make a difference.

One of the things I tell the unions when I talk to them at their affiliation meetings, is that he who pays the piper calls the tune. I say it much better at the meetings, Mr. Speaker, than I do here. The fact is, that has to have some influence on them, and as much as they would not like it to have an influence on them, it must, because what happens if they say to the mining companies, look, we are going to have to crack down on you for your pollution of the environment, and the mining company says, go ahead, but we are going to take our funding away from you. Well, I would suggest that they would be less likely to crack down than if that were not the case.

A MEMBER: What is the historical fact?

MR. COWAN: The historical fact is exactly that, Mr. Speaker. The historical fact is that they have found themselves financially obligated to the corporations, and this bill will ensure that they become more and more financially obligated to the corporations. I will go into that, of course, a little bit later in my presentation.

The chemical company — we talk about the use of chemicals in this country and some of the effects that they are having, and the need for strong legislation, enforceable legislation, to in some way protect us as citizens and our environment in which we live from the adverse impacts of some chemicals.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I hope the honourable member will confine his remarks to the bill and we will talk about chemicals at some other time.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I perhaps was straying a bit too far afield from the subject matter. But what I wanted to say, was that the chemical companies had given to the Progressive Conservative Party last year 40,800, and they had given to the Liberal Party 33,020, so they have some explaining to do also. They gave to the NDP nothing, nothing again. And I don't miss their money. That's the strange thing about it. We're in debt; we don't make any secret of that as a provincial party. We have better financial times and tougher financial times, we don't make any secret of that, but I am not going to hold my hand out to the chemical companies or the mining companies in order to get rid of that debt. I would far prefer to go to the unions, to go to the individuals, to go to our private membership, I would far prefer to do that. Because if I have to listen to someone who has paid the piper, I prefer to listen to the people than the corporations.

Of course, we have a bill before us, Mr. Speaker, in this House — or actually I don't know if it has been reported back from committee stage yet — The Payment of Wages Act. And The Payment of Wages Act puts the banks, the mortgage companies, ahead of the worker, it gives them an advantage over the worker in the case of a bankruptcy or a foreclosure, and the fact is that banks gave to the Progressive Conservative Party last year 283,991; they gave to the Liberal Party 269,028; and I would suggest that that money was money well spent by the banking institutions, because they are getting the type of legislation that they wish, they are getting the type of legislation that they want.

I'm not going to say that the Conservative Party is being bought off; I'm not going to make that allegation in this House. I think it might be a matter of they are just contributing to a party that best represents their interests, and it's a matter of the chicken and the egg, which came first, the interests or the sell-off. I'm not certain which did, and I don't want to make a categorical statement, but the fact is there's an arrangement, there's an arrangement, Mr. Speaker, and that's the type of arrangement that we have to be wary of.

The Member for Inkster had mentioned that, I believe I am paraphrasing his comments correctly, that he saw in this type of Act, restriction; that he saw in this type of Act, legislative requirements — dangerous — and I see the same in this type of Act, Mr. Speaker. I disagree with the member in the respect that he says that we would be better off without any legislation at all in this regard and let the process unfold before the electorate. I disagree with him in that, but I think that there can be legislation that is brought forward that can reflect the need for some sort of control without being so biased as to benefit one party so greatly and disadvantage another party so greatly as this bill does, a bill that benefits the Tories and Liberals, and disadvantages my own political party.

So I would suggest that, in my opinion, and I am not saying that it is the only opinion that one should listen to, or one should have, but in my opinion the legislation can be developed, that there is a need to develop that type of legislation, but this particular piece of legislation, while it attempts to address a need, fails. That is why as a caucus and as an individual we will be voting against this bill. We won't even be attempting the six-month hoist, because we want to see this bill withdrawn, we want to see this bill taken away like a bad dream, a bad nightmare, Mr. Speaker, because that is what it is. It is a dream of the Tories that they impose a nightmare upon the New Democrats, and that is exactly what they have attempted to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that while we have those restrictive measures for union donations in this bill, what they do do, is they take the cap, or they do not place any cap on corporation expenditures. Corporations can now give to any political party any amount of money that they want, so we can expect to see those types of figures, which I read off earlier, in regard to corporation donations to the Liberals and the Tories increasing. I don't expect any increase in the New Democrats, we'll still get our very little, or our zilch, from the corporations, but it will benefit the two old-line parties, because it allows the two old-

line sources of financial security to increase their expenditures. There is no cap, there is no limit on the donations that a corporation can make to a political party.

What we have in that instance, is we have a corporation like Canadian Pacific which donates 35,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party being able to continue to donate that 35,000, but the subsidiaries of the Canadian Pacific, MacMillan Bloedel donates 13,690, and Norcen Energy, another subsidiary, donates 12,606.56, and Rio Algoma Mines donates 15,000, and Union Carbide donates 4,000, and Cominco donates 5,000, and Pan-Canadian Petroleum donates another 5,000; all subsidiaries of Canadian Pacific. Algoma Steel Corporation donates 6,200; Dominion Bridge donates 12,154, so Canadian Pacific and its subsidiaries has a total donation to the Progressive Conservative Party in 1979 of 97,250.56, and the members tell me that's not going to influence any decisions they might make. The members tell us, or would have the public believe that they take this money from the corporations and that they do not feel some responsibility to reflect the interests of the corporations? Well, if they would suggest that, if they are going to tell us that, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that they think we are either fools or that we are ignorant, and we are neither. We know exactly what is happening.

We can see it in the legislation that comes before this House. We had some legislation — it wasn't even legislation, it was some agreements with Abitibi Paper that we took great offence to, that we felt gave Abitibi Paper a very good deal, as a matter of fact, an unfair deal, when it reflected the interests of Abitibi Paper over the interests of some of the people who lived in the area, and we find that Abitibi Paper donated 6,450 to the Progressive Conservative Party in 1979. Now I am not saying that that deal came about because of that donation, but I am saying that that donation didn't hurt. I am saying that that donation didn't stop them from doing that, at the very best, and I would even suggest that when they were negotiating that deal, that in the back of someone's mind, whether it be the government's mind or a representative of a corporation's mind, there was a debt. It might not have been explicitly stated but it was there nonetheless, and they want to be able to accept from the corporations any amount of money with no limit; no limit at all.

What are they going to do with that money? They are going to use that money to fight election campaigns primarily, to run their organization in-between elections, but to fight election campaigns. So now knowing that they are going to get more money from the corporations, or at least opening the door for them to get more money from the corporations, they have to find a way to spend it, because it doesn't do them any good sitting in the bank. If it did, they might as well not have the bank contribute it to them in the first place. The fact is that they must spend it to get re-elected. So what have they done to reflect what they believe will be an increase in corporation funding for themselves? They've changed the rules of election spending. They said that there will be no limits on campaign expenditures outside of advertising; no limits outside

of advertising, and they make a formula for the advertising limitations.

Mr. Speaker, what they are saying, is that they are going to start to develop campaigns now that rely less on advertising and rely more on buying of expertise, and rely more on fancy, glossy pamphlets. We've all seen the Tory pamphlets in their nice three-colour runs and their glossy heavy duty paper. They've always been able to outspend us on pamphlets, and now they're going to be able to do even more, and there will be no limitation. Before at least, we had a limitation, which said, go ahead and outspend us, but only outspend us to a limit. Now they have taken that limitation away and they are going to be able to spend whatever they want on hired help. They are going to spend whatever they want on signs. They are going to be able to spend whatever they want to pamphlets. They are going to be able to spend whatever they want on campaign headquarters. They are going to be able to spend whatever they want on election materials. They are going to be able to spend whatever they want on everything except for media advertising.

That, Mr. Speaker, will create an imbalance, because we can't outspend them, because we don't have the type of corporation funding that they have, and we don't want it quite frankly. If that's what we have to do to get elected, Mr. Speaker, then there is some glory in opposition. If we have to go to that extent to get in power, then I would suggest that we would be just as they are in power, a bad government that reflects the interests of a financial elite.

Mr. Speaker, what we are going to see as a result of these two particular parts of the particular candidate and/or political party and they should be covered, too. I think of these so-called groups that my honourable friends seem to be supported by, these so-called groups for good government, etc. I also don't want to be restricted from attacking the government in the next election in any way, shape or form because the public will be so anxious to get rid of this government, Mr. Speaker, that they will be beside themselves. They will be running into the polls as soon as they open to pop their votes in for the New Democratic Party, in their haste to eliminate this particular administration, this blue blip, as they called the Clark administration. This will be the other blue blip, the Lyon blip, and it will only be a bitter memory, one that is not openly discussed. (Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, my friend for Pembina says, don't be silly. I now want to deal with the silly section of the bill. I want to show him how his administration has demonstrated that they are incompetent and how they are not fit to govern if they allow this kind of legislation to go through. Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the section that was put in the bill and is now going to be withdrawn by the Attorney-General, where he wanted to establish a commission to —(Interjection)— no, in fact, my colleague is right. I'm being corrected by the Member for Logan. He said the Attorney-General didn't want to withdraw this provision, it was the First Minister who withdrew this particular section. In fact, I hardly ever use the First Minister to back me up, especially when I'm debating with the Minister of Highways. But the Minister said that was a "silly" bid to ban campaign lies. This, of course, is the

notorious section, Mr. Speaker, where the Attorney-General in his notes — and I looked at them carefully — provided an explanation of what he intended to do in Bill 95. He made a 7-page speech and then he brought in a huge package of notes which we got delivered to us on Friday. I don't know how many pages there are here, I guess about 60 huge long pages, 83. All it says about that section is that it's new, sure was new, and that it has been announced that the section will be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, my point in discussing this section here is that I think it's a shocking example of government incompetence. That the Attorney-General was able to bring in a provision to set up a tribunal to examine the truth or falseness of statements by members of political parties, probably opposition members, who would be heard by a high court and that he was able to put that through his caucus — I don't know if the caucus knew about it or didn't. I don't know if you discuss bills; we do, you probably don't. I don't know if they have sub-committees to examine legislation, but they obviously didn't have a mechanism. I don't know whether or not this was discussed in Cabinet but I mean, Mr. Speaker, there must be a vetting process. For a piece of this magnitude, something of this magnitude, so horrendous in the annals of Manitoba's political history, something that's become a national news story, for that to go through the Conservative government and the Conservative caucus is, I think, to their undying shame, that they were not able to spot this or, worse still, that the Attorney-General persuaded everybody of the logic. (Interjection)— Well, the Premier didn't know about it; he apparently was away. He was down in Detroit or some place trying to become the running mate of Ronald Reagan and had to come home — (Interjection)— renegotiating Confederation. (Interjection)— I'm not sure where he was, but anyway, while he was away or at least — (Interjection)— no, he wasn't away. Well bill, this sort of financial gerrymandering of the election process, is that the Tories are going to be able to out-spend us and out-pamphlet us and out-campaign headquarter us, and out-campaign us in the sense of materials during any election campaign. If we didn't have truth and justice on our side I would be worried. If we didn't have the people on our side, I'd be worried about that. I know that it's going to backfire. I know that for all their gerrymandering, for all the unfairness that they have built in this piece of legislation, for all the advantage that they have given themselves and the disadvantage they have thrust upon us, we are going to win the next election, because you can only do so much.

We had a pamphlet that was brought before us a couple of days ago, yesterday, a piece of blatant propaganda, I think, was the correct term for it, and it was a slick operation, and it was a piece of election material. I don't care what they say, I've seen election material, you've seen election material, and we both saw that that was a piece of election material. Sir, we don't have the type of money, as a party, to fight that. We don't have the type of money to put that sort of material on the street. The Member for Wolseley talked about the big machine, the NDP machine that was out there pumping out literature on rent controls in three constituencies. Mr.

Speaker, I had the pleasure as well as the responsibility of doing a number of drops in those constituencies, of handing out pamphlets in my spare time. I did so, Mr. Speaker; I saw all the pamphlets, and they were mimeographed sheets, there was nothing slick about them. There was nothing that I would consider expensive about them. They were just a mimeographed piece of paper that had on it some very pertinent information, and they were dropped by volunteers. There was no organization that went out and dropped those. They were dropped by volunteers like myself; for people who had a spare hour or two and wanted to do some work to make this a better province.

I will stack that piece of literature up and that distribution system . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovanats (Radisson): Order please. The Honourable Member has 5 minutes.

MR. COWAN: I will stack that, Mr. Speaker, against the White Paper, against their slick materials, against their three-colour pamphlets, against their big 4 x 8 signs, against their fancy campaign headquarters, against their hired help, because, Sir, the people know what is good government and what is bad government, and they know that that is a bad government, and they are going to oust that bad government And no matter how they try to put the yoke of financial constraints around this party, this party will hold its head high because the people in this party, the 63,655 individuals that contributed federally to this party in amounts of over 100 will go out on the streets, will spend their 5 minutes, will take their mimeograph machines and will put out the truth and the facts, and they will win the election based on that. Then we will have an election act that is fair, because we don't want to take advantage of that particular party or any political party, because we know that when you take advantage or you attempt to take advantage of a political party, you attack the very system, the democratic system, in which we should all believe and we should all support.

If I have just a couple minutes left, which I think I do, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to one other — what I believe to be a very restrictive part of this act, and that is they have told us that we cannot accept donations from outside of the province, that we cannot accept paid workers who come in from outside of the province. In other words, if a good New Democrat in Ontario happens to work for the party and wants to come in and organize in this next election, he or she can't do that because of their legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't an attack on the process, I don't what is, because while they have said that an Ontario individual cannot come in here to work in a provincial election, they have made certain that as long as Dupont sells one item in the province of Manitoba, as long as Dow Chemical sells one gallon of 2,4,5-T in this province, as long as Canadian Pacific ships in this province, as long as Abitibi Paper makes the wood for one pencil to be made that is sold in this province, they can contribute, and it doesn't matter whether their headquarters are here or in the United States or in the Netherlands, that doesn't bother them. They say

that political parties should not be financed from outside of the province, yet they will take that sort of money gladly and they will write into legislation the protection for their sources of funding and their sources of help.

The quote is, and I am reading from the Minister's notes, "the basis for these provisions is that Manitoba elections should be funded by Manitoba money. A political party should get its financial support from the residents of the province. They should not be propped up by outside influence." Outside influences, Mr. Speaker, let me go through them very quickly because I don't have much time. I read them into the record once before, let me read you a different list. Let me you read the list, Mr. Speaker, of mines that are contributing to the Conservative Party. Alcan; where does it operate in Manitoba? Asbestos Corporation; where does it operate in Manitoba? Assembly mines; where?; Bethlehem Copper; where?; Blake Mineral Resources; where?; Campbell Mines; where?; Cassiar Asbestos; where?; Chimo Gold Mines; where?; Cyprus Anvil Mining Group; where?; D'Eldona Gold Mines; where?; Delta Smelting and Refining; where?; Dennison Mines; where?; Dickenson Mines; where?; Dome Mines; where?; Falconbridge Mines; where?; Granby Mining; where?; the list goes on and on and I don't have time to complete it, Mr. Speaker. But the fact is that they will take that money and they will tell us that our friends can't come into this province to help us during a federal election — a provincial election, excuse me; that our friends cannot send us 100 from Ontario, but they will take 50,000, Mr. Speaker; they will take 50,000 from Inco; they will take 41,200 from Noranda, Mr. Speaker; they will take 10,000 from Falconbridge; they will take all that money and more, Mr. Speaker, and they will tell us, as the Member for Seven Oaks said, that his sister can't come in and help him get elected. And that in a microcosm, that in a nutshell is the intent and the purpose of this Act — to advantage them and to disadvantage us. That is why we demand its withdrawal. That is why the people will demand its withdrawal.

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

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we're reading the same bill, if we are looking at the same piece of legislation, but I don't find all these great flaws in this piece of legislation. I think this bill we are presenting to this House will allow for fair and open elections with Manitobans participating in the elections, with the funding being provided — everyone is allowed to donate money now to political parties. Previously we had a situation, or presently we have a situation where some people are allowed to donate and others aren't, where corporations are forbidden to give money.

The member, I think, overstates his case, and because he does so he hurts his own credibility. We have seen this on more than one issue. We have seen in on the chemical issue, we have seen it on several other issues. He is sloppy with his facts. He is throwing federal facts at the provincial Progressive Conservative Party. He takes federal figures —

money donated to the federal Progressive Conservative Party, and then suggests that it is used here in Manitoba. I don't believe it is, any of it. None of the money was used in my campaign, none of it.

Let's take a specific example. The Member for Wellington mentions the calendar, and I am sure it preys heavily on his mind many a night. However, we'll discuss it, I'll take the time to discuss the calendar, because I think you should know how the money is raised. But let's talk first about what the member suggested about my proposed private members' resolution earlier on when he discussed it. He talked about this heinous private members' resolution that I had, or bill that I was about to propose, which was going to restrict the unions' freedom of action.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing I want to say about that is, that the suggestion that was made about the details of the legislation that I was going to propose, not accurate. The member has somehow got hold of one of several proposals that were presented to me, only one of several, and one that was rejected, by the way, I decided not to go that route. I further decided not to bring forward any legislation this year, because we already have 119 bills, or something of that sort. However he was wrong on that detail and he was wrong on several other things.

Mr. Speaker, I don't seek to restrict the freedom of unions. I believe that there is a useful purpose for unions in our society. I belong to unions, that is representing the workers, that is fighting for better working conditions, salaries. At times that might even involve commitment to a political party, but I think when the union movement decided carte blanche that they are going to support the ND Party and that is the only party they are going support, I think it is bad for the New Democratic Party. It is really not my concern to make the New Democratic Party stronger or healthier, but I think it is bad for that party, and I note that several members, prominent members of that party, including one member in this House, and I have already spoken out against that, one member has left their caucus, several constituency presidents and other people have left publicly, and stated it is because the union movement has too much power in the New Democratic Party, and that New Democratic Party begins to then represent unions only. Let's remember that less than 30 percent of the population of this province is unionized, but further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that when the union leadership ties itself hand and foot to the ND Party it hurts the union membership. It makes it harder for the union movement to deal with governments of other political stripes. It blinds them to certain alternatives which may be better for their workers.

Mr. Speaker, what happened earlier this year? Constituents of mine came to me and said, you know, my union is giving money to a political party, and I spoke out against it, I spoke out against this situation and I was overruled. What was happening was that people who voted for Len Domino, people who supported Len Domino and believed in what I believe in, their union dues were being taken, and still are being taken, and were sent to the New Democratic Party and were used to negate the work those people were giving to me, the volunteer effort.

Mr. Speaker, what we need in this province, and I still believe we need a law like this and we don't have one, we need a law which would allow for the individual members of unions to have a say in where their money goes and what happens to it. Because if you take a look at the Gallup polls, Gallup has surveyed union households, and I will use federal figures, because the member opposite doesn't mind using federal figures and throwing them at provincial politicians, the Gallup polls have surveyed union households during the last six elections, and in not one of those six elections did those people, privately and secretly when speaking to the Gallup pollsters, in not one of those elections did the New Democratic Party obtain more than 30 percent — I will give them the benefit of the doubt — more than 30 percent of union household votes, but yet all the union money goes that way. Yet if you listen to the union leadership you would think that every single unionized person in this country was dedicated to a

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Churchill has had his opportunity for debate. Unfortunately, we only allow forty minutes; we now have the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, let him continue with his speech.

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. What this bill does is restore some sort of equality to the situation. Unions can continue to donate money, all they have got to do is declare it and show it. Corporations can now give money, and they are going to declare it and show it. I think everybody should be allowed to give money, maybe even people from outside the province. I am not hard and fast on that either way. I think the government has a good rationale for it, but I am willing to listen to other arguments. I don't mind who gives the money as long as there is full disclosure. Let the people decide. If Alcan is going to give money to the Conservative Party, let the people decide whether Alcan is being twisted to Conservative Party's policies. If the union movement is going to give money to the Member for Churchill, let the people in his constituency, the people in Manitoba decide, because of the full disclosure procedures, let them decide whether the member has become a mouthpiece for the unions, and whether or not he is neglecting his own constituents and the majority of his constituents who are not members of unions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that to be a fact, but that could be possible.

Mr. Speaker, what I was proposing, and what this bill goes somewhat along the road to providing us with, is a fairer system, a system which is fair to the unions, fair to the members, fair to the political parties, and is all around a better system.

The member mentioned one other point which I want to take up, and that is, he said, well, if we forced the unions to give their money on the basis of where the support of the membership lies, why not corporations? Mr. Speaker, I think there is a difference. There are many instances, when I join a union in this province, when if I don't belong to that union, I can't work. Now, if I have money in Great-West Life, if I hold stocks in Great-West Life, and Great-West Life decides in their foolishness —

God forbid they should ever, or any other corporation — decide to give large sums of money to the N.D. Party, that I can then take my shares, cash them in on the open market, put them into another corporation, and I lose none of my ability to earn a living.

That's not true if you belong to, for instance, pick any union you want that has a situation where you've got to be a union member to work. That's a significant difference.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also talk about the federal figures that were used by the member opposite. He says 28 percent of the New Democratic Party funds came from unions, but those figures don't include donations in kind; they don't include the hundreds or even thousands of paid organizers who work regularly on behalf of unions, who are then transferred to do election campaigns. And my own campaign, I not only had to campaign against my opponents — two other opponents, which is legitimate — and their active supporters, I also found myself having to campaign against men who were paid by unions to work on behalf of the union membership, who campaigned house to house, who put signs up, who went around trying to convince people not to vote for me. But yet the Gallup polls show that the vast majority of the membership who pay their salaries, chose to vote for me, or at least chose to vote for a party other than the one they were promoting at the time of the election.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation doesn't bar that. It doesn't say you can't have steelworkers pounding on doors in St. Matthews constituency. It just says if that happens, you've got to tell the public what they're worth and tell the public what they're doing. You've got to have full disclosure. If I get a large donation from the Bank of Montreal, it's there; if a union gives me money, it's there. You have got every opportunity, through the press and through this Legislative Assembly, to print your own pamphlets or whatever you want to do, to tell people where the money comes from. You've got every opportunity to make the connection.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have conveniently forgotten one very positive aspect of this bill. This bill allows for provincial tax credits. This bill encourages and makes it easier for the little guy to give money to political parties. Mr. Speaker, I'll speak very candidly and frankly. I'm not happy in a situation where large chunks of money are donated to the Conservative Party from corporations. I don't think it's healthy for any party, whether it be unions supporting one party or corporations supporting another party. That's not healthy. I want to see as much pluralism in terms of donations as possible. Let it be understood, though, that even if someone financed my campaign 100 percent, I'd never put up with it, but if they did, I still wouldn't take orders from them.

I speak on behalf of the people of my constituency. A member asked earlier about who paid for the calendar. There's no question about who paid for the Member for Wellington's calendar — he hasn't taken the opportunity to give one out, to tell people what his phone number is, to ask them to call him. (Interjection)— It's also a law office, your constituency office? You also use it to earn salary, to earn your other income? I have one too. My

constituency office is not on Sargent Avenue; it doesn't say solicitor or barrister. It says Tec Voc High School. Yes, that's where I spend my working day. You spend your working day in your constituency office. I suggest the amount of politics that's carried on from those offices is just about equal — nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying earlier that I'm not concerned about corporate donations, as long as there's full disclosure, and I think that's the important part. Tax credits are a good system. The tax credit system, over a number of years, will allow all the parties in this country, it will allow all the parties in this province and this country to get away from depending on unions or corporations for donations. Over a period of time, if we use it properly, if we encourage people to donate, if we educate them about the benefits of donating money, you will find that over the next 10 or 15 years 80 or 90 percent of all the parties' money — all three parties — will come from private individuals. And that's the healthiest possible system. And this bill which the members opposite want to yank out, want to throw out, this bill allows for tax credits.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other point. I think the sword cuts two ways. The member said, well, 28 percent in New Democrats' money federally comes from unions. That's not important, he said, we don't listen to unions, they're not overly represented in our caucus, or they can't call the shots or anything of that sort. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest if large donations from corporations, in his opinion, if large donations from corporations can twist my party's policy, large union donations can twist his party's policy. It works both ways. Neither situation is healthy. We have to encourage small donations from as wide as base as possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't find a whole lot wrong with this legislation. I can see where the New Democrats are unhappy. I think the previous legislation was unfair. Any law which says a union can give but a corporation can't, any law that takes that sort of a stance, is not equitable; it's not fair. This law doesn't make any rules like that. It says you can have any donations you want, unless of course they're from out of the province. The member mentioned that corporations who have headquarters in eastern Canada, as long as they have some kind of a branch here, can give money. That's true of unions, too. That's true, if he wants to have the shop stewards from the stewards' union or something operating here, even though their headquarters is in Toronto, most of the membership is in Toronto, they can still send in people from Toronto to work, as long as they declare. I believe they can, my interpretation is.

Mr. Speaker, the key elements of this legislation — and there are two pieces of legislation which go hand in hand; one, that we have full disclosure, and two, that we have an equitable system where everybody has access to the political system on a fair basis. Mr. Speaker, I find, and it's obvious because — I don't want to speak too long on this, but we've caucused this. We've talked about it. I find this to be a very good bill. I think it's going to make for freer, more open elections, and let the people decide if they don't like where the money's coming from. We had this discussion earlier with another clause in this bill

about whether or not politicians were lying. Well, whether or not politicians are affected by the donations they receive should be decided in the same way — not by legislation, but by the electorate. And I'm sure, having listened to the Member for Churchill, having listened to the Member for St. Johns, having seen close up their ability to speak for sentence after sentence after sentence, often saying very little, but the words continue to come out; after having seen them do that, I know that there will be no lack of publicity if Len Domino should receive some horrible donation from the Transit Workers' Union, or some other union like that. I know that the Member for Churchill will stand up in the House and denounce me as a puppet and as nothing but a mouthpiece for the union movement.

Mr. Speaker, most of what the Member for Churchill said was grandstanding. I took note of his comments about the restrictions on people and funds from outside the province, and maybe that can be discussed in committee. As I say, I'm not certain of that. There may be some merit to that. But most of what he was saying, he was saying in his own self-interest and he was saying because he wants to keep the present system of funding and the present system in this province allows the New Democratic Party an unfair advantage. You don't have to declare donations in kind, which is labour. Unions and other non-profit organizations can give, but corporations can't. It's a ridiculous situation. Let's put this thing on a fair basis; let's let the ordinary voter, after being fully apprised of the facts by the press and by the opposition parties, whether it be Progressive Conservatives or the New Democrats or Liberals, let's let the ordinary voter make up his mind.

I'm confident; that's all I need. I don't need any restrictive legislation to protect me. All I need is a fair and open system where the electorate knows what's happening and I'm sure I'll be returned to this House, and I'm sure they will agree that this legislation is good legislation too, and it's fair.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the business of the House, I might observe that it had not been the intention of the government to accept adjournments on this bill at this stage but we are advised that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to speak on this bill, and so we have given that agreement that he will be able to participate in the debate when the bill is called tomorrow morning. Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 48?

**ADJOURNED DEBATES
ON SECOND READING**

BILL NO. 48
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 48 — The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's sometime since we last dealt with this bill, I believe it was Friday, July 11th. Mr. Speaker, I want to put on record my opposition to this bill. I am speaking on my own behalf. I do not intend to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't argue that members of the Treasury Bench need an increase in their salary that they receive over and above the emolument that they receive as being members of this Legislative Assembly, but, Mr. Speaker, that has been accomplished, I understand, by Order-in-Council. The only thing in this bill that is a change from the present Legislative Assembly Act is the section dealing with the Leader of the Official Opposition, where it was in the Legislative Assembly Act that it would be covered, it's now going to be covered by the same Order-in-Council that deals with the salaries of treasury benches.

Mr. Speaker, when this House was first called into Session in 1977 to deal with an emergency situation that had arisen, the First Minister when he introduced this bill he said he took the responsibility, and that is a responsibility of First Ministers to introduce bills dealing with this, he hoped that there would be co-operation from members on this side of the House, but I refer you back to 1977. There was no consultation with the official opposition or the then loan Liberal in the House, now the Minister of Immigration, in the federal House, the Member for Fort Rouge at that time. The government of the day decided that what the emolument would be for that Session, no consultation with this side of the House; the same thing in 1978 when they upset the formula that was in place, in fact, they made great hay on it. We got, I believe, in 1978 — I think they rounded the figure off. 1977 — total indemnity payments plus expense allowance in 1977 was 18,299.27. They rounded that figure off, Mr. Speaker. They were holding the line, no discussion, just brought in an amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act, a grand sum of 63 cents — grandstanding.

We heard the Minister of Government Services last night accuse this side of grandstanding. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you ever saw a case of grandstanding that was a case of grandstanding. I can remember — oh, I'm sorry I can't mention, that's a no no, that a certain member isn't in this House, but I think people will recognize who I am talking about. There was a certain member of this House who said and threatened that if members on this side of the House opposed the legislation that he would bring in an amendment. He threatened to bring in an amendment to prove us hypocrites, that if we voted for the bill we shouldn't receive the money we should give it to a registered charity.

That's all very well and good, Mr. Speaker. There are members in this House who, unfortunately, this is the only emolument that they receive; they are not able to work. That member is a full-time member of the Winnipeg School Division, working full-time; I

would imagine he is a Class IV or a Class V teacher, which puts him in a 25,000 to 28,000 bracket, plus the emolument that he receives here. He receives more than the First Minister. You talk about hypocrisy. Well, it would be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see if this member is going to introduce these amendments. If this bill doesn't go out of the House, he's going to have to make the amendments in this Chamber when we get into Committee of the Whole, and I shall be very interested to see if this member — who unfortunately isn't present at the present time, but I think everybody here knows who I'm referring to — if this member is going to make these so-called amendments.

Mr. Speaker, there was a perfectly good formula in place, a perfectly good formula. And, the ironical part of that formula is that if the formula had been allowed to stay in place we would be approximately somewhere in the vicinity of 200 less than what the legislation, which on the back page is a sort of an afterthought. I know I can't refer to specific sections of the bill, Mr. Speaker, but it sets the calculation on which the formula will come into place for the 1980 session at approximately 200 more than what the formula would have been in 1980 if the tinkering and grandstanding, absolute grandstanding by the First Minister and by that government over there. They now want their pound of flesh.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting this evening. We were discussing, I think, Bill No. 86, the milk bill. We've already had a hint how much maybe milk is going to go up — 5 cents a litre. The Minister of Agriculture said, well, what's 5 cents a litre — 5 cents a litre. Maybe that's why we're getting this increase, so we can pay for the increase in milk. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, when he introduced this bill, and I refer to Page 5570 of Hansard, and he stated and I'll quote as follows: "I know that from time to time we hear and possibly in the debate last year on Supplementary Supply we heard the statement made, well, until Manitoba's minimum wage is raised, why should the salaries of the members or of the Executive Council be raised? I can only point out in that regard, Mr. Speaker, first of all, it's a comparison of apples and oranges but, even assuming that there could be comparison made in this respect, the last information that I had in that regard was that Manitoba's minimum wage was about the third highest in Canada. So for those who would argue in that regard, they would also then have to accept, I suppose logically, the suggestion that Manitoba's Executive Council and MLAs salary should go up to the third highest in Canada rather than to the fifth or sixth level".

You know, if we're talking about apples and oranges as the First Minister said, here's a classic example of apples and oranges, because the people on the minimum wage do not set their salaries. They are not the ones who decide what the minimum wage will be. It is the government; it is not the Minimum Wage Board because it doesn't even meet. It hasn't met, I think, since this government was first elected to office — hasn't met. And, you know, even with the freeze that was put in in 1978, the salaries, the earnings that the members receive as members of this Legislative Assembly have gone up, and they have gone up a much higher percentage than those

poor unfortunates, Mr. Speaker, who work at the minimum wage level.

We have a unique position in society. Those who are elected to represent people in Legislative Assemblies in Canada, in the federal House, and I believe some councils and some school boards, they have the opportunity, and I know that it's a difficult task when you have to raise the salaries. But, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister had left alone tinkering with The Legislative Assembly Act, left the tinkering alone, we would be approximately at the level that they are now proposing. What were they doing it for? Grandstanding. Restraint? Restraint has gone out the window now, Mr. Speaker, as far as salaries for the members of the Assembly. The restraint that was forced upon the people of Manitoba by this government — the restraint, yes, the restraint. But now they want their pound of flesh; now they want to come up 200 more, approximately 200 more, than what the formula would have brought them to.

They wouldn't have had to come in here with this bill, this bill now. As I said before, there was a perfectly good formula in place, it operated and worked well. All members agreed that it worked well, so why tinker with the formula? They tinkered with the formula because they were grandstanding, and grandstanding of the first water, that's the type. Now, Mr. Speaker, now we are supposed to be nice fellows, go along with them, not rock the boat.

Mr. Speaker, there are members of this Assembly who have young families, they have mortgages on their homes, and they have the same problems as others. I know that they need the money, there's no doubt about it. The hours are long. I think when the First Minister introduced this legislation he said the duties are onerous. They are onerous, especially when we've been now, I think tomorrow will be the third week in Speed-up. The hours that we are sitting here. —(Interjection)— The fourth? We've been here for six months, is that right? Five months, and we're going into the sixth month.

We wouldn't even have to be discussing this bill if they hadn't tinkered and tried to make themselves to be the good guys. We're going to restrain, we're going to show you, we're going to show those people how we can restrain ourselves. Well, why don't you restrain yourselves some more? Why bring this bill in? You didn't have to bring this bill in to increase the salaries of the Treasury Bench members, no way. That could be done by an Order-in-Council and was done by an Order-in-Council.

Pensions. Mr. Speaker, the member referred to pensions; you know, the pensions part. If I wanted to look in here, I think the First Minister said, when he introduced it, it was a cleaning up of the changes that were made to The Legislative Assembly Act last year, to bring them in line. Basically, I don't argue too much with that, I said my piece on that last year. The main part of this bill is putting the Leader of the Opposition in the same position as the members of the Treasury Bench and the transitional, which is on the back page, which is increasing the emolument that the members of this Assembly will receive.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is why I am not going to support this bill, under no circumstances. I'm not going to support this bill. I don't think this bill was necessary in the first place. If they wanted an increase, a very simple amendment to this bill, if they

had wanted to increase the salary of the . . . And I believe, if I remember correctly, I'm just vaguely thinking of the section in the present Legislative Assembly Act dealing with the Leader of the Operation; I think it is tied to the Executive Council salaries. I might be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but that's my recollection of the Act. So actually, there wasn't really any need for that change.

Now Mr. Deputy Speaker, the First Minister, he referred to you and I believe the Speaker of the House, and I agree. I believe he said on Page 5569, where he said the members were the second lowest paid of the members of the Legislative Assembly in Canada, of any Legislative Assembly in Canada, and the Leader of the Opposition. And also they show, Sir, — quoting the First Minister — that your office and the remuneration that is attached to it is the second lowest of any Speaker in the Legislative Assembly anywhere in Canada; and they show, Sir that your Deputy Speaker — that's you, Mr. Deputy Speaker — is receiving a remuneration at the second lowest level in that position in Canada. Mr. Speaker, if your First Minister was so concerned about you . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Would the Honourable Member for Logan kindly repeat what he just finished saying? I didn't quite hear it.

MR. JENKINS: Oh, you want to hear what your First Minister said? Oh, yes, I'll be delighted. He was speaking to the Speaker - not you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because you were, I believe in your seat — but he said, and I quote, "They show, Sir, that your office and the remuneration that is attached to it is the second lowest of any Speaker in a Legislative Assembly anywhere in Canada. They show, Sir" — now referring to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker — "that your Deputy Speaker is receiving remuneration at the second lowest level of anyone in that position in Canada". And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the First Minister had been so concerned about you, which he expressed, I ask you, where is he looking after you? Where is he looking after you in this bill? Those are pretty pious words, but there's an old saying, put your money where your mouth is. — (Interjection)— Well, that's the old saying. Or, put the taxpayers' money where the Premier's mouth is. But he hasn't looked after you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I haven't looked after your Speaker. And I believe when you spoke in the House here one time, you talked about the long hours that Mr. Speaker spent in the Chair and the long hours I believe that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had spent in the Chair down there. And I know from experience the long hours that you put down there. But Mr. Deputy Speaker, if your First Minister were that concerned, where? Show me in this bill that he's looking after you. Oh, piety, piety, that's what it is. He's killing you with kindness; he's killing you with kind words, but kind words aren't going to put meat and potatoes on your plate.

Talk about hypocrisy — and I know we're not supposed to accuse individual members of hypocrisy — but if there ever was a case of hypocrisy it is the speech that the First Minister made in this House dealing with the legislation that we have before us,

talking about how we should be a nice little club here. There was a perfectly good formula in place, it was working, we didn't need the grandstanding of '77 and '78. If we'd had the formula in place and working, the only thing that needed dealing with was the Executive Council's salary and that can be dealt with by Order-in-Council. There was no need for this bill, absolutely none whatsoever.

So, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I can tell you that as far as I'm concerned, I am not voting for this bill.

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

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Because I am a new member, I am not going to try to judge the history behind this debate. I know that there will be very able speakers advising us as to some of the things that have gone before this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to, just as a new member, refer to some of the observations I have made in the five months I have been sitting in this Chamber and the number of months before that and after my election in the bi-election of October.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate to congratulate Mr. Justice Gordon Hall on his report. Unfortunately, circumstances require me not to support all of the recommendations in the report, but I do believe he interviewed every member of the Assembly, and I do know that he put in long hours in collecting the data for the report and in writing the report.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the premise that better salaries may attract better candidates and therefore hopefully better ministers. But because they're not part of this bill, I'm not going to get into the subject of the increases of the Ministers, although I must say I'm sorely tempted and I had written out about a page-and-a-half of notes which I think discretion suggests that I forget for now and save for some future occasion. Suffice it to say that it's fairly obvious that some Ministers are much better than others, some Ministers are much more overworked than others, and when it comes right down to it, I think it's the responsibility of the First Minister to try to make the responsibilities more equal, according to the capabilities and the time that Ministers have to give to the job, according to the capabilities, Mr. Speaker.

There have been disappointments, I know, as far as I'm concerned and I'm sure with other members of this Chamber, in some of the appointments that the Minister has made, some of the announcements that he has made, but I really, because the Ministers' salary is not a matter of this bill, I'm not going to go further into that. I think maybe some of my other speeches have reflected some of my concerns over the capabilities of some Ministers.

However, Mr. Speaker, in referring briefly to the raises for Ministers and for the First Minister, I would say categorically that I would support them, support the concept. I know that they're passed by Order-in-Council, but I would support the concept if, as the Member for Inkster suggested, the raises were put in place and offered to the public for the next election, so that people could run on the ticket of knowing what the salary was going to be, what the

opportunities were going to be. Perhaps we would attract better candidates, Mr. Speaker; I think that everybody would hope so. Unfortunately, I gather that the government side is not prepared to accept that suggestion.

I don't feel comfortable with this bill. I don't really feel that most members are underpaid. There are additional allowances for those who have extra responsibilities. Some people have extreme extra responsibilities; the Member for Logan referred to the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker as being two of those who do put in very long hours and I certainly have to agree with that. But where are they being taken care of, Mr. Speaker? I'm disappointed. I read Mr. Justice Hall's report, and I read the bill and I was very disappointed that the bill did not take more seriously some of the suggestions that Mr. Justice Hall made. Perhaps I can refer members to Pages 10, 11 and 12 of Mr. Justice Hall's report.

Surely the most important thing for an MLA coming into this House, whether it's a new member or a member who's been here for a number of years, is for that member to be able to do the very best job that she or he is capable of doing and is willing to do. And referring to Page 11 of Mr. Justice Hall's report, he says, "There is the subject of research assistance. As earlier mentioned, informed debate is a necessary attribute of any legislative body. With the ever increasing complexity of government, there is a corresponding need of providing more assistance to members so that they may more effectively discharge their duties. Government should explore this matter further and provide all members with adequate assistance, even to the extent of erring on the side of generosity".

And he goes on, there is the matter of office accommodation and secretarial staff for members. "Many of those interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs". Many of those interviewed, Mr. Speaker. "In principle" he says, "every member of the legislature ought to have a suitably appointed office with secretarial assistance so that he may appropriately discharge his duties. The Executive Council should address the subject and move towards its resolution without delay". That's the end of the quote from Mr. Justice Hall's report, Mr. Speaker.

I am grateful to have an office. I know that legislation does not require that I should have that office that is in the basement of this building, and I'm grateful for it. I received it the day after I, having found out that the only thing to which I was entitled as a member was a parking space, I suggested publicly that I would hire a trailer and put it on the parking space and I thought that would be better, because I could put signs on the outside for the federal election campaign. I think that hit a little raw spot, because the next day I was advised that indeed an office would be made available to me. This was two months after the election. For two months I had been phoning and saying, where do I hang my hat, where do I put my feet, is anything going to be made available to me? After I suggested that I could hire a trailer and put it in my parking spot I received an office.

Now this was a benevolent offering of an office to a new member. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Hall suggested, and I am repeating the suggestion, that

that should automatically be something that is made available to any member. Surely the best government is not the least government, but is a government with members who are working at their most effective, and how do you work at your most effective when you just don't have a place to hang your coat, for instance, when you come in here. There are two members of this House, I think, who are so far away from the Chamber that they're not able to have those television extensions so that they can do their constituency work in their caucus room and listen to the debate in the House at the same time. I don't think it's widely known that there are only two members of this House that do not have that ability.

—(Interjection)— It may be a blessing in disguise, as the Member for Elmwood said. But nevertheless, sometimes when one is called out one does need to know what is going on in the Chamber. That's just awkward; it's not a serious complaint, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to point out that there are levels, even for people who are not Ministers and people who don't have special responsibilities, there are different levels of what is available to members in this House.

And I don't think that that's reasonable. I think that all members should have equal access to those resources that are available, Mr. Speaker, and I think most members separately and individually would agree with that. It just has never been done. Mr. Justice Hall has made several suggestions along those lines, and I would hope that the members of the government benches would look at his report and see if something more fair cannot be worked out for members who follow after the next election campaign.

Now the First Minister, in his remarks, said that the increases that are proposed are reasonable and just. Mr. Speaker, perhaps they could be acceptable if there were not hundreds of people in this province who are suffering from the selective restraint which has been imposed upon them by this government, the restraint program which somehow only manages to hit some of the people, Mr. Speaker, notably those who are least able to stand up for themselves. Obviously, we would all like to be able to attract better candidates, better ministerial material, better leaders for our parties — or leader. Of course that would be an advantage in attracting suitable people, Mr. Speaker, because people who are raising young families just sometimes do not feel that their families should be required to make the economic sacrifice that is needed in taking on this job. It's not an easy task for someone trying to raise a family and I feel for some of those who are. My children are grown, and anyway, I'm not the major breadwinner in our family. That's one of the reasons I've always been rather embarrassed to discuss family increases. At City Council I was always hesitant to get into the floor discussion on increases in salary for city councillors, because I was not the major breadwinner. In this case I feel that I must, because I do represent a particular constituency.

There are so many people in this city to whom 15,000 seems rich indeed — rich indeed, 15,000, Mr. Speaker. 13,000 seems rich indeed to a great many people who live in my constituency, and I'm talking about the kind of people that this government purports to be devoted to, the working people, the people who are devoted to the work ethic, Mr.

Speaker. —(Interjection)— The Minister for Highways — I don't know if he listens to what he says, but he said, God bless these people. And I say, all right, God bless them, but first, before we talk about giving ourselves more money, Mr. Speaker, let's look to the poor and the needy before we look to ourselves. I don't believe that any MLA is seriously suffering under the present circumstances. It has been pointed out that a number of members of the House do have outside jobs, I don't know how many.

—(Interjection)— Some do. One or more have full-time occupations. Some of them have disposed of their holdings and have the money invested. There's nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, I'm just saying, let's not ask those who are suffering to give up more than they are giving now.

For some of the members, I note Mr. Justice Hall referred to the fact that the allowance for those whose residences are outside the city has increased from 25 to 40, and I'm sure that was carefully considered and that it was reasonable. That's 1,200 a month, Mr. Speaker, and there are a lot of people who don't have 1,200 a month for their total income. I realize that's only when the House is in session. I'm not begrudging it to them, Mr. Speaker. I'm just saying perhaps we should be content in these extreme times with what we have, and not be asking for more.

Now I would, as I indicated earlier, I would support the Member for Inkster's proposition that this become effective with the next session, and also it seems reasonable that the total income should be indexed. That is a reasonable suggestion, and I can support these proposals because they provide an opportunity for the voting public to make the ultimate decision and to run candidates and to support candidates under the new circumstances, the new set of rules, if they're not satisfied with us and if they're inclined to run people against us. That to me is reasonable. Either way, I want to say that I support the proposition that the Leader of the Opposition, whoever it may be from one year to another, should be paid the same amount as the Minister of the Crown. The responsibilities seem similar and I think that is a reasonable inclusion in the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Summing up, I think that there's no reason for those chosen by the voters of our province to represent them to be paid at the lowest level of any in Canada, but it is, to use a favourite word of the First Minister, it would be reprehensible for us to vote ourselves an increase in our own incomes at the taxpayers' expense under present circumstances, when so many people are suffering. And we heard from those people last week, the tenants and others, the retired people in the inner city, Mr. Speaker. I know that some of the rural members who have young children have particular difficulties, but I don't think those can be compensated with financial payment. So I don't think that anything in the way of extra increments can resolve their dilemma. But I have to vote against this bill because I cannot, in conscience, vote myself an increase as long as the current economic situation continues in my constituency, in the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba. Also, I feel the greatest need of a member is for better facilities, for access to a stenographic pool, for access to research assistance,

and the resources which are generally available in this building, Mr. Speaker, so that all of us can work from the same base and all of us can do the very best job that we can do.

I would ask the front bench of the government to have another look at the Hall Report and see if they cannot come up with some of those recommendations which would help us to do a better job for the money that we are now getting.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to rise to say a few words on this particular bill. I find the task of the position that we hold in this House, one of honour, against the realities of modern times. In past bygone days it was an extreme honour to be one of the 57 people out of a million chosen for this House and I still have a sense of accomplishment when I often said that I would do the job for nothing. I feel now, in speaking to this bill, that if one looks at the realities, because of the position that I'm put in on this bill, I may possibly have to support it. The reason I have to support it is because I find it absolutely amazing that myself, together with members opposite, who are the lowest paid members of this Chamber, are the ones that are standing up and giving some sort of an indication that they're not completely happy with accepting the moneys that are being suggested in an inflationary period to bring us in line with other provinces.

One of the realities is that members opposite voted to, in the Pension Plan, voted to backdate it about eight years so that it would benefit all of them. And they also have a sense of sort of questionable activity, because they vote for this, you see. But I'm in a bad position, you see, because I'm an elected member, since 1975. I have one session to go for my pension, but I'll probably never make it. But the point is, it is through not of my choosing, but through the establishment, the people who have read Hansard. The media never puts anything that I have to say against that particular establishment in the newspaper because they're controlled by them.

So the result is that all my speeches are read by academics and by very learned people and they write me, and they write me letters of support. They say, the reality is you have to stick in there against these odds. And I look to this job of honour against the realities, and I look at when we had that short extra Christmas session when I, I don't know how I ever ended up being the hit man, but somehow or other I had to face the Premier of this province, and I've been in the doghouse ever since. And it was the Member for Elmwood that suggested to me that members opposite would drop, because it was a period of restraint, from 3,600 that we were all entitled to, down to 2,400.00. I went to that very restraint-minded leader of mine and he said, oh no, it's the honour. We're going to work for 1,000.00. So we stayed here for a couple of months for 666.67.

Now that very same First Minister — and I'm not subject to the whip — is asking me to support this bill. But I am a person that would rather put reality, instead of remembering what the First Minister did, what the Member for Elmwood, what the member of

the Treasury Bench backdated for eight years — I remember all those things. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not; I'm a very forgiving man. I was even informed today, it's a beautiful opportunity in 40 minutes, I was informed today that I was kicked out of my office. —(Interjection)— No, the Minister of Government Services hasn't told you that; I found it in a roundabout way. But the media probably brought that on because they put some ridiculous story in the paper about my stand on Bill 83. But I think that when you see the final drafts on 83, you'll see that my faith in the Minister was something that I took and there are changes coming about. I'm not satisfied that there may be enough, but they're there and I'm happy for the changes. But I lost my office because I dared to oppose a member of that establishment.

What establishment am I talking about? I'm talking about the fact of the reality is we should be giving ourselves a raise. Do you know why? Because there is so much waste in government that I could turn around and make up that 130,000 in two seconds. I'll give you a quick 300,000.00. Let's remove the grant from the Law Society of Manitoba we give them every year — 271,511 last year. And we're giving them 63,000 on the Mrs. Hawes case because the poor devils have only got 999,592 in the bank. We don't give teachers a grant; we don't give nurses a grant. And I'm suggesting that when we're dealing with wages . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I wonder if the honourable member could stick to the subject matter of the debate.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I respect your opinion, but what we're talking about is the very fact that on May 10th, 1979, the infamous day that the Department of Justice for the federal government says that I was a bad boy, the headlines read: Bob Wilson said the backlog of court cases is due to the fact that judges were finished by noon. They were on the tee at St. Charles Golf Course because they wouldn't produce. And I stopped the 15 million Law Courts Building, but the establishment always wins because, guess what? Our government is going ahead with the Law Courts Building, sure they are, and I still say it's not necessary.

What does the establishment do? One man here receives an award from Ken Taylor. Him and I know the same person. There but for the grace of God go I, because he gets an award and I get a summons. And what does that same establishment do to me? Why am I entitled — the reality — why am I entitled to an indemnity increase? Because I had to sell my stock portfolio in order to pay the lawyers. I sold my Baretta at 1.80, today it's over 8.00, at a loss of 16,800.00. If I hadn't have been an MLA I wouldn't have had to put up 20,000; I would have been let go on my own recognizance. So because I am a public figure in a fish bowl-type of living; because it seems to be the thing to do that anybody that dares talk up against the establishment they try to get rid of, but unfortunately we still have the fact that, as the Member for Inkster said, the voters will choose. They can't be fooled. The media, who is controlled by this same establishment, who won't print anything in the papers because they might be charged with

contempt, because they have a law for everything, to protect themselves.

When you have the Premier of the province, a lawyer, the Attorney-General a lawyer, and the Leader of the Opposition a lawyer, then it's no wonder they don't have Mrs. Hawes 63,000 paid for by them; it's no wonder they don't have their 271,000 grant removed; it's no wonder that the 15 million Law Courts construction isn't held up, and this is why. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, thank goodness that there is a particular chance to be able to look upon this job with a sense of honour. But the reality means that, I think, I move to support this particular bill because I am going in the hole thousands and thousands of dollars because I put my name up for public office and because the senior civil servants in this government didn't have the guts to go to their Ministers and tell them the problems, so they came and fed it to me, and I stood up against the establishment and I read those particular charges of the senior civil servants, and proof that they gave me, into the record.

I have one right here from a Mr. Edward Kessiloff, of 10 Bramwell Avenue, who has just written me again with more scandalous information about the Attorney-General's Department, of the former government and now. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain people in this province who answer to no one. So therefore, if I am going to stand up and continually, as I have promised to do, and I promised this gentleman and others that I will stand up and I will speak the truth, and I will speak what is happening and I won't be silenced by the establishment. I will take my raise because I need it in order to survive, to begin to fight them again in the next session, when I will get re-elected.

I think that I am standing up here supporting the bill as the lowest paid member, as some of the members are opposite. Because of the stand that I take, as in former days, before I was evicted from caucus, as one of the caucus hit men, one of the men not afraid to stand up to the First Minister, and especially on that 666 and 67 joke of working here for two months for 300 a month, when many of us have to give up our families at Christmas. That's my most productive time in my private sector business.

Let me remind you of some of the joys of being an MLA. All my friends, a lot of them, think that I have the plague because they are wiretapped and all sorts of strange things happen to them. The ATA sends out a directive, don't do business with Bob Wilson, MLA, until it is all over. The First Minister says: Get him out of sight until it is all over. The City business taxes, there are problems; let's wait until it's all over. My business is down about 40 percent and the Royal Bank says, we wouldn't mind if you would take your account elsewhere. Maybe I should use the power that I have in this government to have us change banks and have us go to the Bank of Montreal.

So what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that if you are talking about the honour of this job, and I say it is an honour to be one of the 57 people in Manitoba, but the reality is that for that 19,000 or whatever it is that we get paid, we have a fish bowl existence. We have people following us night and day, keeping files on us, waiting for one tenuous association, one drunken driving charge — (Interjection)— and everyone thinks it's a joke. Well,

I'll tell you something. Some day you may find out that the NDP caucus room was wiretapped for 19 days.

So what I am saying gentlemen and ladies in this Chamber is that I think the people are beginning to realize that there is something over and above the call of duty to this position in this Chamber and I think that it is a special type of man or woman that runs for public office, and if you are going to continue to attract good men and women to the position and be able to run for the position of MLA, you have got to be able to take that pressure.

If you have government involvement in the electoral system paying for part of the costs of running campaigns and you pay a half-decent wage, you will have more people such as myself, who aren't here for the money, who are here because they perceive they had taken an awful lot out of the good life of Manitoba for the first 25 years and said, well, for the next 50 I would like to put something back in. When you have givers who don't have the pressure of beholding to corporations or unions, who will stand up here and work for efficient government and work for honest government; and when they spot something wrong, that they will stand up and not worry about the consequences because (a) they are being well paid, (b) they are having a certain amount of their election expenses picked up by all the people of Manitoba, and not relying and beholding to certain people who donate, either unions or corporate people, to your particular party.

I want to be free of those people. I want to be able to represent the people of Wolseley. I think, when this is all over, I will say to them: I am sorry that I said I would do the job for nothing, but when you look at the balance sheet you will find that in the last five years, Ladies and Gentlemen of Wolseley, I can prove that I went in the hole but it was still an honour to serve you.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan and the Member for Fort Rouge have made comments with which I agree and which I do not intend to elaborate on or to repeat to any extent. There is one point made by the Member for Logan which I checked out with him since he spoke. He rather surprised me when he said, or I thought he said, that the difference between the formula which was set in the legislation and which was disrupted by what he called the grandstanding of the First Premier, and I agree with the terminology, that the difference between that formula and what is proposed is only a couple of hundred dollars. That figure surprised me, Mr. Speaker, because I had asked someone to give me the difference between the actual and the amount that would have been paid had there been no freeze of this grandstanding nature, and the difference, according to my calculation, was somewhere around 1,500 or even 1,700.00.

I pointed this out to the Honourable the Member for Logan and I believe that he agrees from his own figures that he had omitted one item and therefore that, rather than a 200 difference between what the amount would have been, had the formula been

allowed to run its course, and the amount that is now being proposed by this bill, is a difference of some 1,500, give or take a couple of hundred, so that the amount is substantial. The Member for Logan authorizes me to say that he is still opposed to the bill, maybe even more so because of that.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am opposed to this bill. I am opposed to it for the reasons mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge when she spoke about the restraint of this government; when she spoke, and she didn't elaborate, on the user fees imposed by this government on people in a reverse manner of taxation from progressive taxation, which they inherited from the NDP government, to the regressive form of taxation, which is their bent and which is their way; and the way in which they have dealt with the minimum wage, as referred to by the Member for Logan; all of which is a disgrace for the government of Manitoba to have carried through and all of which does not entitle it to come, at the same time, and propose an increase which leapfrogs, substantially leapfrogs, the formula which was brought in a number of years ago and which I consider a fair, sensible approach and one which would take into account the increase, the inflationary cost of living, related not to the high income of MLAs but related to the average industrial wage. I agreed with it then and I agree with it now, Mr. Speaker.

So that, from what I could read, the figure, the artificially imposed figure on the last page of this bill, which says that; "it shall be conclusively deemed that the indemnity for the session in 1979 is conclusively deemed to have been 15,000," is a farce. We all know it's a farce. It would appear as if there was some mistaken calculation whereby there was some debate as to what it really was and, therefore, it had better been determined by this the highest court in the province, to have been adjudicated at 15,000, because that is what the wording is, that the indemnity allowed and payable under clause so-and-so of that Act, the former Act, or the existing Act which is about to be changed, to members for the session in 1979 shall be conclusively deemed to have been 15,000.00.

That is the one part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, which is phoney, and the reason it is phoney is that there was a desire to increase substantially the income or the remuneration paid to MLAs and that is the technique in which it was stated. As I say, it is phoney and one with which I disagree.

The figure I was given, which would have been the figure had the normal formula been allowed to run its course, the figure I was given amounts to 13,992.00. So the difference there is just slightly over 1,000 between what is the actual that would have been there, had the formula been allowed to run, and the 15,000 arbitrary figure that was inserted into this bill. That 1,000 would then, of course, have to be increased by 500 because of the additional amount payable as an assumed expense account. That makes a differential of 1,500. Impose on that the additional application of the formula for 1980 and you have a pretty substantial increase, an increase to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that it takes care of the grandstanding of 1978, substantially more than that; it takes care of the figure mentioned by the Member for Wolsoley. I didn't know until today that he had confronted the Premier and had a fight, and believes

that he suffered irreparable harm and damage to his position in caucus because of that fight. It makes up for that and it reflects for the future a substantial increase, which is not related to the past and to the formula.

Mr. Speaker, it would be more acceptable to me if it wasn't in the light of all the play acting that went on in 1977, 1978. It would be more acceptable to me if the government had shown the same kind of thought and consideration for the people who are the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about the general restraint; I am talking about the way they have reversed the progressive taxation into a form which imposes a greater hardship on lower income people.

The one point, Mr. Speaker, which would have been justifiable, and Mr. Justice Hunt did refer to it and, apparently . . . Hall. Mr. Speaker, they are both honourable judges and I just made a mistake in the name. Mr. Justice Hall who made the recommendation. He referred to it; the Member for Fort Rouge did it a little bit more, and I repeat it. I think, Mr. Speaker, and I recall in my interview with Mr. Justice Hall, I made the point that I thought the important thing to create a better opportunity for effective contribution as an MLA is one which would give greater assistance to the MLAs in their jobs, greater secretarial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, you know that when we were in opposition prior to 1969, we limped along on a very, very low budget allowed for assistance to MLAs. When the NDP was in government we made some substantial improvements. I now know, having had the experience of being in government, that what we did was not sufficient. There should have been more done. And I know it because, Mr. Speaker, it was only when I was in government that I realized that the expertise of government is available — (Interjection)— the resources, that's the word, the resources of government are available to caucus of the government and, therefore, the needs for research assistance on the government side are substantially less than they are on the side of the opposition. So I would have liked to have seen, and there was every opportunity in the world to see greater assistance to the MLAs in terms of secretarial assistance and, even more important, in terms of research assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken of the need for additional recognition of the extra burden of costs imposed on MLAs who represent northern areas. Their burden is much greater. Their financial burden is much greater than that of the rest of us MLAs who are in the southern part of the province, and I think there could have been something done about that. I was really surprised, I didn't study the bill that carefully, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the First Minister quoting Mr. Justice Hall, or not Mr. Justice Hall, possibly, but general figures in relation to the inadequacy, in his opinion, of the remuneration paid to the Speaker and to the Deputy Speaker, and then to learn, and I admit freely, Mr. Speaker, I did not read the bill from that standpoint, to learn that there was nothing done to carry out the corrections that appeared so necessary to the First Minister. I would not accuse him of an oversight; I think he does everything in a very deliberate way,

unlike other Ministers of government who are guilty of oversight. So that's forgiven.

Mr. Speaker, one other comment I would make and that is that, in my opinion, the payments to members for intersessional committee meetings is inadequate. In my opinion, the payment of 50 for a day of the session I believe is inadequate. There are members of this House who I know, in order to participate in a committee, lose, have to give up in pay, in earnings, substantially more than the 50 they receive. As long as it is considered that we are not on full-time salaries and as long as it is considered — and I don't share that necessarily, but to a large extent I recognize it — as long as it is considered that MLAs outside of the Cabinet are doing part-time work, then it should be recognized that intersessional committees are inadequately paid at 50 a day.

Mr. Speaker, these are my comments. I am opposed to the bill in principle, and that is what we are debating on second reading. I intend to vote against it. My main reason in rising is to state that, as far as the New Democratic Party members are concerned, it is a free vote on this question. It has been discussed; it has been decided. There will be no one who will be breaking ranks because there are no ranks being formed on this issue. We have some members with one point of view and some with another, and some members who agree in part and disagree on other parts. So that there is absolutely no expectation that there will be a vote of any consistency and, if there is, it is only one of accident, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that in 1965, when an exorbitant and dishonest pension plan which was drawn, I probably can accept quite a bit of the responsibility, probably more than any other member in the House at that time.

Last year, there were some changes in the pension plan again, during my illness or I certainly would have had a few words to say at that time had I been here. Probably because of that I have been invited by certain members to express my views, especially the Member for Virden who seemed to be quite interested in what I was going to say on this subject, and the First Minister, who said that he hoped that he could be in the House when I did participate in this debate. I wish that he was here also, because I have a few words for him.

Mr. Speaker, this year when this bill came in, I looked at the bill. I studied again the last year's changes. I read and re-read the Hansard and the debate of 1965 and later, 1967, when the pension was reintroduced. I looked at the experience of 22 years in opposition, in government, in Cabinet. I look at the economic situation that we are going through at this time, and I listened quite carefully to all the speeches that were said in this debate.

The first approach you would think that the Premier, for once, was changing; that he was very much less arrogant than usual. It wasn't the Premier that we know so well, that Manitoba knows so well. I think, I don't want to misquote him, his exact words were "without imputing any motives at all to anyone who takes a contrary position, government should

avoid the kind of short-term political gains some people think accrues to opposing or not bringing in a reasonable increase in salaries."

This was the appeal, right from the heart, to please don't rock the boat, we're together in this, let's not make any waves. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this, in effect, is even being more arrogant than usual. A person that could stand here and call us stupid and red and pinko, and rat-infested nest, and so on, and then all of a sudden tell us, well, let's get together on this and don't impute motives.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation the same as any other legislation that we have here and I think that we should be honest and we certainly should be critical, if there is any reason to be. This is why we're here. We're talking about paying ourselves; well, let's start doing our work before we do anything else and let's not try to form a big brother club, and we'll pass that without any difficulties at all.

I certainly have tried to be honest, non-partisan in this report. Like the speaker that just sat down said, this is going to be a free vote. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we're over and above everybody else.

First of all, when we raise our pay or we change anything that profits us, what do we do? In 1965 and 1967, last year and this year, it's always introduced after the Speed-up motion. We don't bring this thing out of the House. We heard the First Minister say today, when somebody was talking about a strike in Thompson, if you're interested, get them back to work. We tell people that they should be back to work but we decide what we're going to pay ourselves.

This is not mentioned in the estimates. I stand to be corrected, but I don't remember any time that there was an increase or change in the pension that was mentioned in the Throne Speech. It doesn't go outside of the House. The public can talk, the press can take a shot at us once in awhile, but we don't have to answer to anybody. It's always in a way that we try to sneak it through. It's a couple of times to try to bribe people or blackmail people to make sure. The Minister is saying for a short term, don't do something for a short term, it's not going to pay. And if there ever was an example of that, and it was mentioned that short session of a month or so, well, all right, they wanted to make a point, I guess. But when? It was something that was passed. We looked at the baseline, the basic pay, a few years ago and unanimously we said that's fair, but . . . So we wouldn't have to come back and increase our salaries all the time, it will be indexed. And the first session here, what did the First Minister say? No, it's restraint. And in one shot we're going to get everything back. What about the other people that were told to tighten their belts? Are they going to get everything back? It doesn't look like it, Mr. Speaker.

Now we hear the same thing, it's been brought in during these 22 years that I talked about that I've been in here and it's always the same thing. I can tell you I was reading in 1965 the same, same reason: You will attract better members. That is a joke. That is a joke because I remember when they were getting 3,200 when I started and the members were certainly just as good, if not better, than we have at the present. So this is something that is repeated and repeated, no matter what. It was used last year; it was used when we indexed this; it was

used in 1965 and 1967. It always the same thing: You are going to attract better people. You mean to tell me that we have a better Premier than in the days of Roblin; that the Minister of Agriculture is better than George Hutton; that the Minister of Health is better than George Johnston; or that anybody here in this House is better or more conscientious than Mr. Campbell that sat here for 40 years, and that sat in the House, he didn't have a TV to see who was speaking, he sat right in that seat. Well, he sat in probably nearly every seat for 40 years. Is there anybody that feel that he can stand up and say that they are a better man than Mr. Campbell is? I don't think so; I don't think so. So that, to me, is a joke and I certainly don't support the proposal of the Member for Inkster, who said it with tongue in cheek, and the Member for Fort Rouge who says, well, let's do it next year. It's the same thing. It's the same thing, and it's just maybe keep more of us people in it. If we want better people, if we say the pay that we're getting now doesn't attract good people, maybe we should have a rule to start new instead. Maybe this is what we should do.

Now they say, we want to make it possible for anyone to run. I don't hear too many people — the people I hear that say I can't afford it are the people that are in the big brackets, the people that are professionals or people that are in large corporations, they don't want to be bothered. But it's not going from 20 to 40 or 60 that's going to change anything for these people. If we're talking about the people, say, well, I've heard it said in this House, the sacrifice that my family should make. Well, let's look at the system. Let's do away with this nonsense of the speed-up motion where we're here morning, noon and night, and look at this time. At this time, because we're trying to ram it through, it's going to go through tonight. There's hardly any members from the press; we're just going to have to listen to this malarkey, just for one day and then we'll go ahead and we'll have the money in our pockets and everything is fine. —(Interjection)— That is the most asinine and ridiculous statement that I have ever heard. The member said, "Don't take it." We're here to legislate; we don't legislate for any person. We legislate for all of us. In the debate, we say what we think and it doesn't mean then that it will pass for some and not for others. If anybody wants to make any donation to charity or to anything, that is their business and their business alone and I don't have to have this member to tell me what to do. If he thinks that I'm going to be silent because he's going to say, don't take it, then he's got another guess coming. He's got another guess coming.

We also want the members to be independent. Are we going to have that good members — if we pay them enough money that they're going to be independent, then they'll sell their soul, because they'll want to stay in. They won't stand up like the member did, because it will be too lucrative and they don't want to take a chance of losing this money. Oh, and another thing that gripes me — the other provinces. The other provinces. What the hell makes us think that they're doing things right, if they're getting more or less? And you know, what do we say? We can't compete with Alberta, but all of a sudden, we're competing with Alberta and the other

provinces. This is another one, the other provinces, and we're justified, we can go ahead full barrel because the "other provinces." And where do we stand with the other provinces? That is also asinine. The whole system is wrong, the whole system, Mr. Speaker.

I try to put everything on paper and there is one thing, and I went through it and other people will go through it; the rehabilitation to get back to normal, especially when you've been in Cabinet I'll admit is very difficult; very difficult. I don't know what we could do on this; I don't think it's just the pay. Now let's really look at the pay. Are we getting such a low pay? And I might say, Mr. Speaker, I also am concerned and I want to say why I'm concerned because of this period and because of the way restraint was brought in. This is why I'm going to oppose the bill. I suppose that I like money as much as anybody else and it wouldn't be that difficult to convince myself that I deserve an awful lot and that I live in a fish bowl and so on.

Probably if I tried hard, I could talk about the other provinces and so on, but let us look at what we're getting. First of all, the indemnity; one-third of what we're getting is tax free. One-third. Mr. Speaker, I'm not looking at the exemptions that we have, I'm looking on a salary now. If we paid on 15,000, if we paid tax on that and no other revenue — this is not looking at any exemption; it's just a round figure — On 15,000, I would pay 4,165 if I had no other revenue at all. On 22,500, which is that 7,500, I would pay 7,069, so that's another 3,000 more. So it's not 22,500, it's 25,000-26,000 that I start with. Then if you have a little more, if you have a little revenue, and most of these people have some revenue, if you had 20,000, instead you would pay 6,054 and then if you added on that 7,500, you would pay 9,428.00. That's 3,374. So a Minister then would have about 4,000 more. So he'd have the 43,100 and then another 4,000, he'd have about 47,000, Mr. Speaker. I think this is one thing that we forget.

And then the contacts that people have here. And then let's look at the spoils that go to the victor also. The Ministers, to start with, and I dare say there is not too many Ministers either from this side of the House that were former Ministers are sitting there now that are getting less money than they would normally. There are a few, not too many. Mind you, it has been pointed out to me that that might be true, but in four years or nine years or eight years, you might be gone, you got to start over. I know, I went through it; and that's true. But right now, there's not that many that are getting less.

Okay, we have 17 Ministers on that side to attract people; 17 Ministers, and you see what they are going to get. There's four legislative assistants who get added remuneration. There's a Speaker and a Deputy Speaker and the Whip and the members on the board, nearly everybody, except probably the one that's in the doghouse, probably the only one that doesn't get any extra remuneration. And I'd be surprised . . . I challenge anybody to say, yes, I don't, I get my MLA pension salary and nothing else. And then the trips that the people have, and the per diem. The per diem this year, for the rural members — the rural members, about 4,000 or 6,000 more. Last year, the members of Cabinet who had a full-

time job, who are paid this full-time job, and should have a home here, they are getting it now. They are getting it, Mr. Speaker. And then the pension is a pretty damn good pension. The pension you can work out into a pretty darn good pension.

And what do we do? We talk about restraint and we're going to save money. What did we do this year? We had a chance to take four days. We could have met on Friday afternoon but we called committee instead because we did not want to have four days in a row because the rural members wouldn't have had that 40.00. That's 160, it's not a hell of a lot, but it adds up. It's 160 that we would have saved on all those that are getting that 40 a day. (Interjection)— I beg your pardon? — (Interjection)— We didn't have to come on Monday; we didn't come on Monday. All we had to do, if we wanted to save money and accomplish just as much, we could have met in the afternoon of Friday instead of calling a committee for a couple of hours and come Saturday morning. We didn't have to do that if we had been sincere, Mr. Speaker. (Interjection)— No, I'm not saying I'm perfect but it's time that we look at each other . . . and I'm supposed to shut up and not rock the boat and take it. What have we done? What kind of a restraint do we have? You know, what have we done for the people here? We talk, for instance, the bottom of the ladder. I'll believe, Sir, in restraint and I do believe in restraint when all of us . . . but that is not the system. Now they're talking about inflation and they're suggesting economists. The majority of them are saying, well, there's only one way, you've got to have more people out of work. It's the only way.

I saw something that I think is quite interesting and this economist — there is not too many of them seem to put it in words that I was searching for, for a long time — and I'm talking about, I want to quote from Mr. Barry Bosworth, he was the former director of the Council on Wage and Price Stability in the States, of the Council of Economic Advisors. This is what he has to say and I think it makes sense: "If the answer is that the economy and its system has to have seven or eight million people unemployed all the time to give us reasonable price stability, and that's basically what the answer seems to be, then you've got to change the system. You can't continue to operate under the current rules of the game, because that's socially just too high a level of unemployment. You can't expect these people not to riot. The talk about a gradual unwinding of inflation is nonsense. If you're going to get it down, you have got two policy measures to do it with. You can take a recession more severe than this country experienced in the post-war period or you can go to the wage and price controls. We need fiscal and monetary restraint and a slow rate of growth of the economy for a period of time with, unfortunately, high levels of unemployment, but we can cut the cost of unemployment if we also at the same time institute wage and price controls. Solving these economic problems is like treating cancer. You have got to have an operation and when you are done, you've got to have chemotherapy and after that, it might not even work. In the political arena, all you see today is slave drive solutions from the perspective of one group or another. Each says it won't hurt you. I don't see any movement which says you're going to face

up to the economic problems in a way that can be socially maintained."

And that's the important thing. It's so easy and if we think, what have we done . . . the members on this side, collectively — the member said, you're perfect. Nobody has a monopoly on goodness or virtue, that's not what I'm trying to say, but collectively they don't seem to give a damn.

You've got a Minister that says it is the time, in this period, it's got to be overwork and underpay. Overwork and underpay. You know, we get people — the Minister of Health said these people, there was a fair settlement. We looked at people that are getting an average of 9,692.80 a year and in their first year they were offered 100 a month for 13 percent — that would give them the great sum of 10,892, and then the second year at 10 percent, 1,080 a month and that would bring them, after two years, 11,982. Well, aren't we ashamed? Aren't we ashamed? Can any of us live on that? The First Minister says let's take care of himself, my family comes first. Before he accepted to come in this House as the Leader of the Opposition he had to assured of 30,000.00. And that's not wrong. You've got a responsibility for your family. But damn it, these people have families also. These people have to live. We're talking about an increase more than these people's salary. Now, what do we do? The Minister of Health, a couple of years ago, thought that was so great that he'd given these people that kind of raise. That was so great and we heard again, today, the Premier say, tell them to go back to work. And the supporters and friends of these people are saying, these damn unions run it all.

You know, the the best climate would be going back to slavery. It would be a hell of a lot cheaper to operate and business would make all kinds of money. Now how can you compare when you talk about percentage increase and you have an increase here for somebody that in the 30,000-bracket, 8 percent gives them 2,400, and 12 percent would give them 3,880, so in two years they have an increase of 5,288. I'm talking, for instance in the health field and I started right at the bottom — 30 — there are no doctors that I know that are making only 30,000.

Look at the people making 50, and that's certainly probably still below the average and they would get in two years, they would 10,480 increase and the total salary after increase of these people working in the hospital, some of them would be 11,982.

There is another thing that I want to say and it's a statement made by His Holiness, the Pope. He says the persistence of injustice threatens the existence of society from within, he declared. This menace from within really exists when the distribution of goods is grounded only in economic loss of growth and a bigger profit. When these persist, a big gap between the minority of the rich on the one hand, and the majority of those who live in want and misery on the other. And that's what it's all about. I've been asked by some of the members, what am I doing on this side? Maybe I don't agree with a lot of the things that are said, but I think at least there is an effort to look at all the people and treat them as equal. Equal doesn't mean sameness, but how can we come here after four years of restraint, four years or three years and the Minister telling us, yes, you've got to be overworked and underpaid in this time and then

come in and have increases like that. Look at the pension, look at the tax-free thing, and how many Ministers here, how many of them were making more? How many members of the Cabinet who are making more before they get this increase, I'd like to know, on this side and on that side? There's not that many. And we are supposed to show the example.

You know, we're told let's close ranks and that's what gripes me. And then you're told, if you dare stand up, oh, you think you're perfect. I'm supposed to shut up because I'm going to be affected by it. I think that is ridiculous and we try . . . Tell me any bill that came in and every single time comes in after the Speed-up and at this time at night, that we were told that it has to go through tonight, and it doesn't go outside the House and it's going to pass. — (Interjection)— What about my government, what have you got to say? Oh, Cass-Beggs, that's great. Are we talking about Cass-Beggs? We're talking about you and we're talking about me, and we're talking about these people here in government. Don't try to bring these red herrings here . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I welcome this interruption, these red herrings that they bring in. It shows how concerned. Let her stand up and make a speech and tell her that she's justified, that's she was making so much more money and she thinks she has to come here and be a great member of the Cabinet. Let her say that. Let her say that, Mr. Speaker. We come in, in this House, and we bring in all kinds of restraint for a certain class of people but we're over and above that, and there is that greed.

As I said, I can fairly justify it. I'm not saying that the salary is going to be exorbitant. I'm not saying that. But I'm saying that it is wrong at this time, with the attitude that we had, that we said that we can't afford it. Well, we'll say it is a drop in a bucket because we're only 57, but there are hundreds and thousands out there, so they suffer. They tighten the belt so the few hundred can live right.

1 — My former Leader was so chastised when he . . . Probably he tried to pinpoint too much, but the idea, the intent. I'm not afraid that it'll come back to haunt me, when he said, you try to equal, you try to even up a little bit anyway; you don't try to create a big gap and have a class of people, the slaves on this side and the bigshots on this side who say, hey, down there, tighten the bloody belt. But they're drinking their Crown Royal and they're driving their big cars. There's no difficulty. Tell me of anybody that's stopped drinking Crown Royal because of restraint; tell me. Tell me anybody in these corporations that are not living as well now as they were before? Do you know of anybody? Do you know of anybody? — (Interjection)— What? The Governor-General, he represents you, I don't know what he drinks, and I'm not reflecting on him either. Maybe he's getting too much money; maybe he's getting too much money but what has that got to do with us here. We can't control that. It was very good when Michener was getting it, when Léger was getting it, but now it's somebody else. You know, he belongs to the low class and he has no business

there. He has no business there. Norma Price should be Governor-General, she'd make a hell of a Governor-General. She'd think, you know, it belongs to us; it's our world. There's a bunch of snobs and there's a bunch of slaves, but we'll live like kings. We live like kings and they tighten the belt so we can live like kings, and that's what's going on.

That is why I am opposing this bill, Mr. Speaker, at this time. I think it is hypocrisy. I think it is a bunch of malarkey, to say this is what the other provinces do; this is what has been done, so we attract better people. Look around at better people. Look around at better people, Mr. Speaker. I've seen a lot better people than we have in this House and I've seen some just as good. — (Interjection)— I beg your pardon? No, you didn't, because we didn't have any restraint. I'm talking and I'm certainly not ashamed of the way I filibustered in 1965 and you remember that infamous bill that they had to withdraw and if you want me to talk about that, I'm ready. I can see that the same Premier was pushing that also. — (Interjection)— How the hell does he say I've made the same speech three times? — (Interjection)— He wasn't here. He heard it in his sleep. — (Interjection)— Who? Well he might scare you but he doesn't scare me, I can tell you that. He might scare you but he doesn't scare me, not a damn bit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's going to be all right. You laugh all you want and tomorrow it will be over, and you'll be able to put it in your pocket and you'll be able to sleep well when you think of that snob and these people at the hospital that are getting 11,000.00. I hope you sleep well. And when you say I got to take care of my family, don't think of their family, they have no families, it doesn't count. They have no families; they're not entitled to anything.

So that smart aleck from Portage, he's overpaid; he hasn't said one bloody word in three years, the silent three out there, not one bloody word and we're going to pay him, what? 40,000.00? They think it's a bloody big joke. Well, if he hasn't been overpaid, I don't know who has. I think that the people pushing a broom in the Thompson Hospital at 11,000.00 — (Interjection)— What have you got to say? Oh, you, I thought it was the other silent fellow out there. — (Interjection)— What about the NDP? Well, one at a time, for crying out loud, I'm only getting paid so much; I can't listen to three at the same time, Mr. Speaker.

I'm only saying, all right, let's get our money and let's get paid but not when we say to everybody else, tighten the belt, not when we say to everybody else, tighten the belt. We have Ministers of the Crown that tell us, tell them to go back to work, they have no business striking, and other people saying this is the time to be overworked and underpaid, and we should have more people out of work. We'd teach them. They'd come back and work. You know, they're human beings. They're people with families, with kids, with wives. — (Interjection)— They're what? Oh, that's going to help the others. Maybe I'll take it and give it to somebody else. I won't do like you. You know that story you told us on health, after one of your liquid dinners there, that you got all mixed up. Well all right, well I don't have to do the same thing as you do. So, if you want to be smart, two can play the same game, Mr. Speaker.

1 — Now this is it. You know, the same bloody thing: Don't take it, don't vote it or don't rock the boat. You know, we're a club. We're a little club here, the heck with everybody else. Mr. Speaker, now they ask me why I'm sitting on this side, maybe they know why. Because I could not look at myself in the mirror after doing some of the things and saying some of the things they've said and then say, okay, let's have an increase.

Figure it out, Mr. Speaker, figure out the money. There's going to be what? 22,500, another 3,000, and I'm not talking about the Ministers. If we want to talk about the Ministers, they start with 43,100; 39,000 of what they save by not paying tax, that makes 47. Some of them, not all of them, some of them will get about 6,000 for 40 a day, another 1,500 before it's indexed, 54,500.00. They've got a car. They've got all kinds of help. If they want to freeload, they can find a party any damn time they want. They don't have to pay a cent for booze. They can go on trips. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's what I said, you don't have to pay a cent for booze, if you want it. You can have all your social life through your work. I'm not saying that's right; I'm saying that's what you can do. I don't drink that much. I don't drink that much, maybe I would. If I liked it, yes, I would have gone to all those parties, like you do, like the other people; yes, I would have, yes, sure. I'm saying some of the assets. —(Interjection)— What are you moaning about? I am saying that a Minister can, he has enough invitations, can live if he wants; I'm looking at the possibilities of all the sacrifices that you do. I'm saying of all the good things that you can have, if you want.

I know that a lot of them — and I'm not going to mention names, I'm not necessarily talking about people in the House now — have done that and that are doing it on different levels of government, that are travelling first-class, that are boozing it up on the plane; yes, that's what I'm saying. I could have been on a drunk every damn night when I was a Minister, I could of. And I had a free car. —(Interjection)— No, not a bit; the only guilty conscience is damn it, I didn't like it enough, and I lost too much out of it because I didn't take advantage of it.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that some of things that you had, because you are saying that, oh God, the great sacrifice that we're doing. There are different motives. There are people that want to work for their provinces, there are others that are on ego trip — and I'm including everybody, all politicians — there are others that like power, recognition, excitement or a little bit of all —(Interjection)— Yes, and people. So all those things work together.

It's not just this thing that we've got to pay them to make them independent and to make sure that we attract the best people. That is so much malarkey, Mr. Speaker. So the thing is, let them come back next year when they've done something for the people at the bottom of the ladder and then maybe I'd change my mind. As I say, it wouldn't take very much to convince me that, oh yes, we earn it and so on. It has it's good points and it's got some bad points and — they didn't like it — I tried to point out some of the good points and some of the privileges, or whatever, that comes with the job. I'm saying it's not quite as bad as that. I think that there aren't that many people that will get 54,000 or 55,000 for

Ministers and God knows, we see some and you say if this guy is worth 55,000.00 . . .

Mr. Speaker, let's not add this thing again that we're going to have a better class of people. Come next election, the majority of people sitting here will be back here. There will be some changes and there might be a reverse, I don't know. They might be sitting there and we might be sitting there. I don't know, that's a possibility. But they'll be mostly the same faces, year after year. There are some that go and some that stay. It's not going to make any bit of change and in a few years we'll want to change it again. We'll want to change it again.

It's time that we start to think in our society that we have to have a little more compassion for the people at the bottom of the ladder, especially in the difficult times. Those people can't adjust. They have no other revenue. They have nothing else, and they can't beat the income tax either. That's another deal. Tell me this, why is there one-third of our salary that is tax free? Is there anybody else in Canada except the Governor-General and 1 — the other politicians that get tax free? Who? Oh, I'm not talking about the guy in certain levels, through all the loopholes. We won't go into that, please. I know that they'll have these foundations and so on and they beat the income tax. I'm talking about the ordinary guy. Where does it say that one-third of your salary will be tax free, except the politician? —(Interjection)— They have the expenses, what expenses? We have another 900; if you're from the rural area, you get 40.00 a day. —(Interjection)— We heard, no, it's the fellow next door, the Minister of Labour. There was a question asked, what about the firefighters up north? What did they say? Well, you know the minimum wage, but we have to transport them; the government transports them. Well, my goodness. They have to take them to the fire; they're supposed to leave when they can and run wherever there's a fire, I guess. And that's the kind of money, minimum wages, and we made . . . Well, after all, it's more than that. They get their transportation for nothing. They're taken to the site. They have to pay for their own clothes, and so on. —(Interjection)— What expenses, I'd like to know. A Cabinet Minister has one-third of his MLA indemnity tax free, and he has an expense account. You have an expense account. —(Interjection)— Sure, for expenses. What do you want to do? —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? You say sometimes, oh, I'm doing this as an MLA . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member has three minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Okay, thank you. —(Interjection)— About what? I don't think it would matter what I say; you're interested in worrying about yourselves, in pious statements about other groups of people below you. What I do with my money is my business; what you do with yours is your business. We are bringing in legislation and all you have to do is do like me and you won't have to worry, because you won't get anymore and neither would I. If you want to challenge me, go ahead. Vote as I do. I would imagine you have a free vote on this; vote as I do. Stand up and say, fine, I agree, maybe we should have more money; but in this situation,

when we tell the people tighten your belt, well, we'll do the same thing. I know this won't happen because we're always talking about somebody else making these sacrifices but not us, and that's what's the matter with that government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in general, and I wish to explain my remarks but in general I support this bill in principle. I think it is impossible to justify the discrepancy between the kind of salaries that men in public life receive in relation to wages paid in private industry and, even if we look at other governments, I think it's of great interest to show the discrepancy that exists between elected politicians and members of the Civil Service or the bureaucracy in Ottawa and in Winnipeg. For example, a Deputy Minister in Ottawa, and some of my colleagues in the House on both sides may not realize it but a Deputy Minister in Ottawa today can earn 85,000; 85,000, when a Minister in Manitoba earns 35,000. If you attempt to examine the responsibilities, the high risk, the pressure, etc., it would seem to me that those salaries are out of line. Similarly, Manitoba Deputies apparently earn 53,000 or can earn as much 53,000.00. It seems to me that a person who has the highest responsibility should not be earning less than a person who is second in command.

I want to just relate briefly, partly for the benefit of the First Minister, that one of the only private conversations I ever had in my life with former Premier, Duff Roblin, although I have spoken to him socially a number of times, I did once speak to him in, I think, 1967. We had an exchange in the House. He misunderstood something that I said; he attacked me. I explained what I had meant to say; he apologized and invited me for a discussion. We had a broad-ranging talk about politics, about education and so on, and I remember him saying to me at that time in '67, I think it was, that he had intended or had raised the salaries of Ministers at that time. He said the reason was that they were getting too far out of line with Deputy Ministers 1 — and he felt that he had no other choice but to raise them at that time. —(Interjection)— One of my colleagues says it's a good rationale and I agree. I don't know if my colleague agrees, but I agree that it was a good rationale because I do not believe that a Minister should earn less than a Deputy.

Now let's talk about MLAs. When I look at salesmen and the kind of money that they make, when I look at former executive assistants of our administration who are all making 25,000 and up, 30,000 — I know of people who are making 30; 35,000; these are men who are younger, they are now working in private industry and they are making considerably more money than MLAs — I find that difficult to reconcile. I heard the other day that the Toronto policemen are asking for 27,500 and that seems to be not a bad salary in relation to the 19,000 or 20,000 that MLAs in Manitoba now receive.

But I want to say to the First Minister, because it's a rare occasion when he's here when I'm speaking, that he did take some credit and, in my judgment,

did grandstand when he froze the salaries of MLAs a year or two ago. He will now have to accept the responsibility for the raise. If he was able to accept the credit for freezing salaries on the basis of restraint, he must now accept whatever public judgment is contrary for, in effect, instituting a raise which only really, in effect, puts us back to where we should have been in the sense of annual increments.

I also say to the First Minister that I believe that he also did some grandstanding in regard to the mini session that we had a year or two ago and that the sort of money that he decided to pay out at that time was not proportional and was not directly related to the amount of money that would have traditionally been paid. So, on two accounts, the First Minister has gone to the public and said, look at what a wonderful thing I have done. Now he must go to the public and say that he is, in fact, shouldering the responsibility for the increments for MLAs and for Ministers.

Mr. Speaker, I want men in public life to receive decent salaries — and women, too — because I don't want kickbacks; I don't want slush funds; I don't want favouritism and so on. I don't want people in high positions, particularly Ministers and MLAs, to be subject to pressure and to be subject to temptation because somebody comes to them and offers to either give them money, or makes donations and expects favours in return. I don't men in public life to be sorely tempted because of the fact that they are not adequately paid and may be tempted to take money under the table or to consider it.

Mr. Speaker, we know — and I'm trying to make my remarks in 10 or 15 minutes — we know that public careers are short. We know that most men in public life have careers that last only four to six years and that these are often productive years and that the responsibilities are pretty heavy. We're looking at 2 billion budget, we're supposed to ride herd on the Civil Service, and I do not apologize for the kind of money that I have received, either as a Minister or as an MLA.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people in this Chamber who are full-time members. I define a full-time member in the following way: First of all, a person who dedicates all of his time to public service and, secondly, one, say, who almost does that but perhaps earns a small amount of money outside, maybe a few thousand dollars, I would regard that person as full-time. So if you apply that rule to our political party on this side of the House, I think you would find about a dozen members who are, in effect, full-time, and rely on their indemnities to support themselves, their families, etc. At least half-a-dozen of our people solely dedicate their time to the responsibilities that they have and another half does earn a very small amount of money outside and almost dedicate all their waking hours to their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's unfortunate that every now and then an article appears in the press talking about a four-day week or a four-and-a-half-day week or 23 hours a week. These are very deceptive statements. They are not accurate in the least. —(Interjection)— My friend for Rock Lake agrees, and if you take our party, because I can only speak about our side, I'm not quite as familiar with what is done on that side. It was the Premier who agreed with me;

I make that correction. I'm only talking now about an MLA, 1 — Mr. Speaker, just an MLA on this side of the House. We have a noon-hour caucus every day; we have a Monday evening meeting. We often have responsibilities on weekends, a political party's social function. We have our provincial party, hold sessions and so on, and so on. We have an endless number of appeals for donations and tickets and all sorts of contributions.

I was phoned tonight, a very small thing; a lady phoned me and asked me whether I would send in some tickets she sent me and so I made out a cheque and put it in the mail.

A MEMBER: It happens every day.

MR. DOERN: It happens every day, that I do recognize is a voice from Rock Lake.

Mr. Speaker, then there are some problems involved with trying to relate an occupation to this occupation. Even if a person is attempting to work outside the Chamber, it can be extremely difficult. I have tried and I have found that I have had some difficulty. I will tell this very briefly. In '67, I tried to go back to teaching. I went to the Winnipeg School Division. I went to the Adult Education Centre; I spoke to the principal. The principal looked at my qualifications, worked out a program and said we can hire you full-time. The administration said the same. The recommendation went to the school board and the members on the school board, who are not of the political persuasion that I am, held an in-camera meeting and deleted my name from a list of 40 teachers who were to be hired.

On a second instance, I went back to my school division in Transcona. The superintendent was somebody named R.B. Bend. I took a year's leave of absence. When I went back, I asked whether he had an opening for me, he said, no, he didn't. Well, I was a little suspicious of that but perhaps it was so. So some people are able, maybe if you're a lawyer, maybe if you're a farmer — although I don't know, there aren't too many full-time farmers in the House anymore — maybe with certain jobs you can relate to political life but in most cases it's very difficult. People want you to either to work year round or they don't want you at all.

Mr. Speaker, I'll mention just a few other things. As I said, I don't want people taking money under the table. I don't like the practices that we have across the country in regard to temptation. I don't like the way it's done in the Maritimes, where apparently slush funds are a way of life. I'm looking at a column here by Allan Fotheringham written in March where he mentions that Reagan, Canada's Minister of Labour, was receiving money from the provincial Liberal Party before and during the time he was Premier of that province. The First Minister here has had a similar experience. I don't know the status of that fund today but I believe that the First Minister of the province should receive an adequate salary so that it isn't necessary for the incumbent to consider or accept additional supplements from outside sources.

Mr. Speaker, what happens to people once they are defeated? If I wanted to take the time, I could read a number of interesting articles that were in the paper in the past year. An article by Michael Pitfield,

who was Secretary to the Cabinet in Ottawa, who, speaking of Ministers said, "It is full-time, it is demanding, it is precarious and, above all, it is the most complete possible fulfillment in peacetime of a citizen's duty to the state." Then he ended by saying, "A society that, as a matter of habit, ridicules the politician and deprecates his function is on a course almost certainly to encourage disunity and inflation and absolutely certain to destroy democracy."

I could read from an article by Sandra Gwyn in the Saturday Night talking about what happened to former Ministers. They didn't seem to do very well after they left the federal House, or an article in Macleans from a few months ago talking about a long day's journey into oblivion, in terms of what happened to defeated members.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take issue with one of the Tory backbenchers. I'm sorry he isn't here. It's the Member for St. Matthews and when I think of this bill, and I think of this debate and I think of him, I can only say that there is a powerful smell of mendacity coming from his seat. I say that he was the one who did some grandstanding a few months ago, and he talked with 1 — high principle sounding that he was going to bring in a bill and this was the anti-hypocrisy . . . Amendment, I should say. In that amendment, he was going to force anyone who didn't vote for this bill to turn over their money to the government or to a charity or something like that. Mr. Speaker, that was a lot of nonsense. It was a lot of posturing. I regard that as low-grade politics. I regard that as grandstanding at somebody else's expense. After he obtained his publicity, I suppose he dropped the matter; after he got somebody to write a letter in or he wrote a letter and gave it to somebody and posed as a great self-effacing, self-sacrificing politician. Mr. Speaker, I resent that kind of politics and I have to say to the Member for St. Matthews, that I do not appreciate that type of grandstanding and I must say I'm very disappointed in the fact that he attempted to score points in that particular fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm making my speech and I'm not going to comment on the speeches of anybody else in this particular debate. Mr. Speaker, Justice Hall, I think said correctly, that he was going to recommend certain changes and that he was going to make up for "12 years of neglect" during which time the salaries remained unchanged, and he's talking there of Ministers. I say to the First Minister, that he has to accept the responsibility for introducing this bill for MLAs because it was because of his action that he has found it necessary to do so now. I also have to say to him that he has to accept the responsibility for an increment for Ministers. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that I believe it is absolutely essential that there are annual increments for MLAs and for Ministers, and I say to the First Minister that regardless of what is done now, and regardless of the future, whatever amount of money is set for Ministers, there must also be annual increments and it's because of the fact that there wasn't that we now find it necessary to see legislation or an action taken in regard to that particular provision.

I come from the teaching profession and I think the method that is used in the teaching profession is a good one, namely, that they have annual

increments, based on merit, and that every once in a while they renegotiate the base. So I don't know how often that occurs, maybe they try it every few years, maybe they try it every five or ten years but whatever the decision is, whatever the government decides to do, once the base is set in regard to Ministers, in regard to MLAs, then there must be annual increments. This is only fair, it's done in practically every other occupation I can think of and it is ridiculous that on the old system, that every five or six or seven years, after there had been no increases, there's suddenly a screaming headline in the paper saying, 40 percent increase — MLAs pay rises by 40 percent. And everybody assumes in the public that therefore that was a one year whopping increase, meanwhile it was 4 or 5 percent spread over a period of years compounded.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that this is a free vote on our side. I want to pay tribute to my colleagues who discussed the matter and decided that each of us would vote according to our conscience and according to our best judgment and that, therefore, there will be some division of opinion on this side of the House. But I say again, in conclusion, and if my Leader was here I would say it to him, and he will probably read the debates later, and I say it to the First Minister as well. That annual increments is the key to a fair system of payment for Ministers and for MLAs, and minimum wage. Once that was set and that was introduced by our government and I was one of those who was foremost in the fight for having an indexing system. Unfortunately it was not indexed in terms of Ministers' salaries. So, I'm saying that whatever occurs after this debate, no First Minister should interfere with that system and the First Minister who is responsible for the administration of this province a year from now, namely, my Leader, the Leader of the official Opposition, I say to him that we must have annual indexing for the Minister's portion of the salary as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join the debate on this bill that the Premier brought in, Bill 48, in regard to 1 — increase in wages. Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to support this bill for a number of reasons. The fact is that while much of the argument has been put forward by my colleagues on the manner in which this legislation came in, the method that was used back in 1978 to stop the indexing, because of a supposedly very serious economic situation in the province, at the time the government changed hands. In fact, the Premier had gone out throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, and was telling the people of Manitoba that this province was in a state of bankruptcy; that we just could not go on; and that it was necessary to bring sane government back to the province of Manitoba; and that it would be necessary to tighten our belts. We had to end waste. In fact the Minister of Health, referred to it as "taps of waste" throughout the province and he was referring to nursing homes and health services throughout the province and I thought that the method of indexing

was a good one, that was brought in by our Leader and our caucus when we were in government.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that our Leader was a bit on the stingy side, he wasn't a Premier that was very loose with the purse-strings, unlike what we hear from the government members, how we were wasting money. As far as the MLAs were concerned the Premier was always a bit on the conservative side, he didn't think that we should be being too liberal with our salary increases. And when we brought in the indexing, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to overcome the problem that we had to face from time to time to adjust the wages of the members of the Legislative Assembly, and you know, when I hear the members say, and there have been a few comments made, and I think the First Minister mentioned, I can only paraphrase, Mr. Speaker, that we had to attract people, better people, to the Legislature. And this is one way to do it, was to increase the salaries of the members of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally the members of the Legislative Assemblies throughout Canada was kept artificially low and it was done to attract a certain class of people. It was kept at such a low rate so that only wealthy people could afford to become members of the Legislative Assembly. And the reason it was done in that manner, Mr. Speaker, is because if wealthy people were the only ones that were able to be elected they could look after their interests, they were able to look after their interests and that is the reason why the salaries were always kept low. So that only people who had ample financial resources would be able to afford to be elected for public office and some, it was mentioned, for prestige, for whatever reason but the main reason was so that they could protect their own interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had increases over the years. I recall that when I was elected, Mr. Speaker, I think the indemnity was 4,800 back in 1971, and that was increased, Mr. Speaker, to I believe, 7,200 or 7,600.00. There was an increase and there has been increases every year until an indexing was put in place. So, Mr. Speaker, I thought that that was an ideal situation that we have the Premier of the province, back in 1978, telling us, telling the people of Manitoba, what a bad economic situation they had inherited from the previous administration, and that there was no way out, that we had to do away with the indexing of our salaries and that we had to restrain.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, they set out to do away with all the programs throughout this province that affected ordinary people and we have seen, Mr. Speaker, that the economy, if that was true in 1977, if that statement was correct in 1977, what is the situation today? What is the situation that we have here in the province of Manitoba? I don't have to elaborate on what's going on, Mr. Speaker. We have done away with all the programs, we have cut back on health and we have cut back on most everything in services to people. And our deficits. We have had three deficits under this government and the deficit this year is going to be a whopper and if they're still in office next year, there's going to be another deficit, that's almost a foregone conclusion, Mr. Speaker. And our per capita debt has increased from approximately 3,400 to now probably 4,300 or

more, and we haven't seen the last of the drought, Mr. Speaker. We're not sure how much more Supplementary Estimates will have to be brought forward or warrants will have to be underwritten to carry out other expenses that may come up between now and the end of the year, fiscal year.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than the province being on a more financial economic position that it was three years ago, I find that it is a lot worse economic situation. And if we couldn't afford a little indexing, Mr. Speaker, if we couldn't afford the little indexing in 1978, we certainly can't afford any increase today.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have to elaborate on the economy of the province the papers are full of it. And I only keep the odd one, Mr. Speaker, but you look in the papers every day and you see some bad news. No matter where you look. Manitoba growth to be the lowest in 1979. Mr. Speaker, we can't afford this raise. Mortgage Defaults Rocket; Provincial Cutbacks Hit Handicapped. A paper from the Member for Dauphin, Dauphin constituency paper, Dauphin Herald. Provincial Cutbacks Hit Handicapped. Indian Metis Need Jobs, Economist. Mr. Speaker, we can't afford the raise. We can't afford the raise, Mr. Speaker. Most Manitoba Wages Fail To Equal Food Costs. — (Interjection)— They laugh, they laugh, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba Report, Balancing On The Poverty Line. No matter where you look, Mr. Speaker, we find that the economy is in a very serious situation in this province. I find that it's unreasonable the way that the First Minister, the position that he took in 1978. I agree with some of the remarks that were expressed by the Member for Fort Rouge when she said that there should be better facilities for the MLAs. Mr. Speaker, to be quite frank with you, if we were to have adequate facilities, it would probably cost more than what we are going to receive in this increase at the present time.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that when I first came in here that we had a club room, a group room that we had to work out of, and three or four telephones and 13 or 14 MLAs all in the same room. If you received a telephone call, Mr. Speaker, you couldn't hear. There were always delegation coming in, people, constituents coming in, Mr. Speaker. There was always a steady traffic into the caucus room. It was impossible to write a letter. There were no facilities whatsoever and I immediately asked that this be resolved. It took seven years, Mr. Speaker, before we got the offices downstairs where we could go down and make a private telephone call or sit down in silence without any interruptions and spend some time on notes for a debate. It took seven years to obtain, Mr. Speaker, and I was very happy when those offices were provided for us.

Mr. Speaker, with the new boundaries there is no doubt that it's going to cost more, there is no doubt about that. In the Ste. Rose constituency we should have two constituency offices. It's a long narrow constituency and there is no doubt that if we were to obtain those facilities it would probably cost more than what we are to receive here. Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should have better facilities and it was suggested, I believe, I don't recall exactly the year but there was a suggestion that the Liberals be deprived of a caucus room because, I believe, there were only three members in the House. Mr. Speaker,

I spoke on behalf of the Liberal members. I suggested that they should have a place where they could meet and be able to serve their constituents. I agree that we should have good facilities; we should have better research facilities in order to be able to discharge our duties in a very responsible manner.

As far as my own situation is concerned, Mr. Speaker, when I ran for public office I said to myself that I would spend as much time as the job required in order to represent the people in the manner which I felt they should be represented. There are degrees to this, you listen to the Member for Matthews, when he made his comments, and he said any MLA that can't hold another job besides being an MLA isn't worth his salt. I am paraphrasing but I think that's what he said. Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Matthews can probably run around his constituency in an afternoon and probably call on 75, 100 homes if he so desired. But that's not possible, Mr. Speaker, in a rural constituency, particularly in the wintertime, particularly in some seasons, early spring, for instance, when the roads are bad, it's not very easy to get around. So when the Member for St. Matthews says that any member that can't hold another job, well, sure, a member could hold maybe two or three jobs if he doesn't want to represent his people. If he doesn't want to do a job representing his people, sure, he can hold another job. But those people normally, Mr. Speaker, are not re-elected.

I don't accept the argument that paying higher wages will necessarily bring better people to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. In fact, if we put the salaries too high, we'll be attracting those vested-interest people who come here not to serve the public but to protect their own interests. That's not the kind of people that I like to see in a Legislature. Mr. Speaker, we do attract people. It is very seldom that we don't have the 57 members. There are occasions when there are, for whatever reason, there are vacancies. But, Mr. Speaker, we very very seldom see less than 57 members in this Assembly.

So that argument can be dismissed, and I know the First Minister used it, and it can be dismissed outright as having no validity whatsoever. I don't use hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, because I don't like that word. But members opposite would be the first people to stand up and say, legislate some workers back to work, if they were on strike; the first ones to come up and say that. (Interjection)— They are the first ones to do it; I'm not saying that I wouldn't do it. There are times when I would do it, but I am saying that the Conservatives are the first people who would stand up and say, "Get back to work and take what they're offering". Now if you fellows don't like the wages that you're getting here, go on strike. Don't come here, stay home. The province may be better off if some of you stayed home.

There are some members that don't stand up, maybe once during the whole session, and they get 20,000, 22,000, 25,000, stands up once during the session and speaks, maybe for five, ten minutes. That's quite a salary, Mr. Speaker, to pay to someone to stand up once during a session. That's pretty good wages, I think, and it's not very hard wages.

MR. WILSON: They're paid by the word, Pete.

MR. ADAM: That's pretty expensive by the word, that's for sure, as I said, the Member for Wolseley suggests. The only person that I thought was maybe underpaid here is the Speaker because he's the boss, and the boss should get a pretty good salary. It's not a very good job; I wouldn't want that position. If you have to make comparisons and I know that's been used and it shouldn't be, but if you're going to have to make comparisons with other jurisdictions, well, why not compare the Speaker's salary? I see nothing in there for the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't see anything in there for the Speaker. So if we're going to compare with other jurisdictions, I'm sure that the Speaker of the Manitoba Legislature is one of the lowest paid in Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, I speak on your behalf and I hope that my words will —(Interjection)— we don't want to have to pass the hat around for the Speaker.

If the First Minister had not tried to posture back in 1978, when he was trying to tell the people what a good government they had elected. Mr. Speaker, when the truth comes out and the truth is found out what the Conservatives have done to this province since they have been in office, they are going to turfed out and I predict that they will be turfed out at the next election, regardless how hard they try to change The Election Act and The Elections Finances Act, they will be turfed out, Mr. Speaker. I will not support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I think it's clear that if the Member for Ste. Rose got paid by the word he'd be a millionaire by now. There seems to be some feeling on the part of the honourable members opposite in criticizing some of our colleagues on the backbenches because they haven't gotten up and spoken as long and as frequently as some of the members opposite have, that somehow they're not fulfilling their role as MLAs. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they have probably fulfilled it more adequately in the short speeches that they have made to this House than some of the members opposite have in the frequent and lengthy speeches that they make over there. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not primarily why I'm participating in this debate.

I think it's necessary that even though it is a thing largely of individual conscience, I think it's necessary for somebody on the government side, some more of us to put our thoughts on the record. I am particularly anxious to do that in order that my constituents and the people in Manitoba, indeed, are aware of some of the circumstances regarding the pay of members and members of the Executive Council, and are aware of just how the salaries are set and the sort of grandstanding that is going on here and I guess does go on from time to time as salaries are set.

I'm quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to go to any of my constituents or to the public and tell them that I get 15,600 a year as a Cabinet Minister, who sits in the highest councils of government in this province, responsible for a department that has maybe 1,700 permanent employees and a budget of 55 million and that I get 15,600 a year for doing that, when there

are dozens —(Interjection)— Well, that's what the Member for Fort Rouge says, is that all I get; she knows, that is all I get for being a member of the Executive Council. She gets the indemnity for being an MLA, just as I do. She doesn't get the 15,600 because she is not a member of the Executive Council. I might add, she's not likely to be a member of the Executive Council. Those happen to be the facts, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Elmwood made the argument that he didn't think that it was right that members of the Executive Council should be paid less than the senior person, the Deputy Minister in the department.

I'm not prepared to go quite that far, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is out of line where it stands today and it's interesting to note that when the honourable members opposite, especially the Member for St. Boniface, made such a case for the poor, as he put it, of the province, that if we looked at the salary that Cabinet Ministers were getting when it was brought in in 1967, I believe it was, and they were getting 15,600, if that salary had been increased over the years, Mr. Speaker, at the same percentage that the minimum wage has been increased, then Ministers today would be getting paid in the range of what a Deputy Minister is getting. It would be approximately 45,000.00. Now that's on a percentage basis, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lac du Bonnet can work it out if he doesn't accept my figures. I invite him to work it out.

The Member for Inkster was proud to say that they had not increased the Cabinet Ministers' salaries when he was a member of the government. What he doesn't point out was that when they became members of government in 1969, that 15,600 at that time was rather a good wage, much closer to the Deputy Minister and other senior levels of government than it was today, probably the equivalent of approximately a 30,000 salary today, so he didn't need to increase it at that time, Mr. Speaker.

I am quite prepared to have my constituents know that I get 40 a day per diem while the session is on. The Member for St. Boniface said, I should maintain a home in Winnipeg. Somehow, because I'm a Cabinet Minister, I'm supposed to live in Winnipeg. What does he think about the rest of the province? Where are members who have become members of the Cabinet supposed to live? The Member for St. Boniface says we're supposed to move to Winnipeg. We happen to choose to continue to live in the constituencies that we represent and because of that. Mr. Speaker, I have to maintain two residences. I have to maintain my home with my family and my constituency, and I maintain another residence here in Winnipeg. I commute back and forth. I go home on weekends; I come back in Monday morning. I'd like my constituents to know that's the way I live and those are the kinds of expenses that I have to incur to maintain two residences, and the 40 per diem that I am able to collect while this session is on merely covers my expenses while I am doing that, no more. The members opposite could make whatever they wish of that per diem, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to defend that, to explain that. It is not a matter of defending it. I'm happy to be able to explain that to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I know, in speaking to my constituents and others, that they understand what goes on here. They know how the salaries are being set. They know who is going to vote on them. They are quite aware that those who vote against them will also be taking them. They will be paid those salaries even though they vote against them and the public should be aware of some of the people who are speaking against these raises and of the economic circumstances of some of the people who are speaking against these raises. The fat cat lawyer from Inkster, living in Westgate and able to command 75 an hour as a lawyer, says that he is proud that he didn't have to increase the Cabinet salaries while he was a member of the government. The Member for St. Boniface, who is independently wealthy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: The member is reflecting on the ethics of a former Cabinet Minister, the Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker, who he alleges was practising law while he was a Cabinet Minister. I want him to know that was not the case. —(Interjection)— Well, he didn't say that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it was obvious the member didn't have a point of order because that's not what I said. I said he is able to command, he is able to command. That is what I said. I said nothing about what the member did as a Cabinet Minister, nothing about it. —(Interjection)— That's right. And I said that the Member for St. Boniface is an independently wealthy person, by his own admission, who wouldn't have to work another day in his life if he didn't want to. It's easy for him to stand here and make the kind of case that he did tonight.

Mr. Speaker, there are other people who don't have the background or the capabilities, the training, to be able to spend eight years in government and still go out and demand 75 an hour after that for their services. There are people, when they come into this Chamber and serve here, that during the period that they serve here, their ability to earn a living on the outside declines for various reasons because they are not able to devote the time to it or for the reasons that the Honourable Member for Elmwood pointed out.

The Member for Inkster says, they get a pension, they get a pension. Mr. Speaker, that pension does nothing for the person who comes into this House for four years. I don't know exactly what the period of qualification is but I think it's probably possible for people to serve for seven years or so in this House under some circumstances and then be out and not have a nickel of pension, and if they happen to be here during that period of time in their lives when they should be at their maximum earning capability or establishing a base for earning, that they have lost a great deal while they've been here.

I think that the public generally, Mr. Speaker, is prepared to see that the people who serve here get a fair wage, just as they are prepared to pay the senior people in our universities, in our governments,

provincial, civic, federal, in our unions, in our industries, and what the people are paid that serve here now is certainly not comparable to many levels of salaries that are paid outside of government, Mr. Speaker.

There are one or two other points that I think it would be advisable to deal with briefly and one of those, at least, is the suggestion by the Member for Inkster that pay levels should be set before an election; they should be passed before an election and come into effect with the new Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, we can see the kind of posturing and grandstanding that goes on under these circumstances, when people can speak against it. I don't say that everybody does. I'm quite certain that there are some people who sincerely believe that they shouldn't be paid more and they really wouldn't want to take it, but at least under these circumstances the government has to take the responsibility for bringing in the bill and probably, for the most part, seeing it passed, but the other members who vote against it also at least have to take the responsibility for cashing their cheques. I can imagine the kind of posturing that would go on if we voted on this to come into effect with the next session of the Legislature.

Can you imagine the political hay that would be made by people who could vote against that bill and go out onto the hustings and say, those money-grubbers in the government brought in that bill and they voted for it; I didn't vote for it and I haven't taken a nickel of it. I don't think that would be a very viable kind of approach to take, Mr. Speaker.

I reject that suggestion and I also reject the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Inkster when he said that every member here made his decision, his or her decision, to run for this House when salary levels were as they are now. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is analogist to saying that anyone who ever takes a job should never expect to get an increase, because after all, they were attracted to take the job at a particular level of pay. Surely that argument is not a sound one, Mr. Speaker.

So I don't think that it's necessary to attempt to deal with some of the points that the honourable members opposite have raised that really don't have that much to do with the principle of the bill before us, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to place some of those facts on the record and to point out some of the fallacies and the arguments. I know that there will be criticism for the government for having brought in this bill and for eventually, I trust, passing Orders-in-Council that will in fact raise the salaries of Cabinet Ministers to some extent, although I feel quite confident that the end of our four-year period in government, that the compensation of Cabinet Ministers at that time will be no more than equal, if that, in terms of the purchasing power, to what it was when we assumed office in October of 1977. An increase of 5,000 will be about a 33 percent increase and I think I am correct in saying that we've recently signed an agreement with the Civil Service that will give them what, over 20 percent in two years, so I don't —(Interjection)— 5,000; the Member for Lac du Bonnet says that we received 5,000 a year ago. I wonder if he'd care to substantiate that. We did not receive an additional 5,000 in pay and I told you what that was for, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable

Member for Lac du Bonnet calls that an increase in salary. When I have to maintain two residences, Mr. Speaker, then that amount of money goes to maintain that second residence. It's not an increase in pay and there has not been an increase in pay voted. It's simply one more example, Mr. Speaker, of the misleading kinds of statements that the members opposite want to make.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the bill warrants being supported by the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know my colleague from St. Vital wants to participate too and it's very late and I don't want to be long in making a few remarks on this bill. It's not usual that I agree with the Minister of Natural Resources, but I agree with a lot of what he just said, and I am one on this side who will support this particular piece of legislation.

As the Member for St. Johns indicated we have agreed, our caucus has agreed that we will have a free vote and so there are some of us who will be exercising our freedom in supporting the government in this particular piece of legislation. I'm going to try to avoid repeating some of the criticisms and some of the points that have been made by other speakers on this side and try to, as much as I can, make a few points that I think and I hope may be original and contribute in some way to the debate, and yet be very brief in doing so.

I believe that while we did set up an indexing system which wasn't bad, nevertheless, in my view, it wasn't adequate because I suggest, Mr. Speaker, even without the freeze, the index system that we implemented a few years ago has still allowed Manitoba to slip behind many other provinces. I think the report that was issued by Justice Hall indicates — and I don't have the report with me — that by no means are we comparing very favourably with other Legislatures in the country and, for whatever reason, the index — and I think I know the reason; I'm not going to go into the details — in itself, while it's okay to some extent, has still allowed Manitoba indemnities to slip behind many of the provinces. I agree with those who have said that it's an honour and a privilege to be here, and indeed it is, but I don't think there is anything wrong or evil with being paid adequately for doing what you're doing.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, it has become, over the past 20, 30 years, more and more of a full-time job. I think you could argue, well if those members in the Opposition would only stop talking, we could get out of here a lot quicker. But we used to think that when we were on the other side and I think it's not just since I've been here, this is a development that's gone on for many a year; I think 20 or 30 years, maybe before that. Where the session — and I'd like to do the research on it — the session has become longer and longer. Government has become more complicated, Mr. Speaker, and it's difficult to just get in and out here in a matter of weeks. So because it has become, if not nearly full-time, it's become half-time, I think that, as the Minister who has just spoken has

indicated, it's indeed very difficult, as the Member for Elmwood has said, for many members to do other things to supplement their income. It's very difficult to get an occupation, to get a type of a job, or to become occupied in some way which gives you supplementary income, so many members end up earning nothing other than what they receive here as MLAs.

Now there are a few people who are, I would say, very fortunate because they happen to be in a particular occupation that enables them to work very nicely at their regular occupation and still be a member of the Legislature. I'm talking not about Cabinet Ministers but other than Cabinet Ministers. I think lawyers, there's no question that lawyers are in that particular position. In fact, I would suggest that being in politics actually helps a lawyer. It generates more business for the lawyer. I'm not criticizing lawyers for this; I'm just saying that's a fact of life. You come in here as a lawyer. You probably do a lot better, maybe for having been here, even though you may only serve one term and again I repeat, I'm not criticizing lawyers. But it just happens to be a fact that it blends very nicely.

But for most occupations, for many of us, it is just not possible to earn any significant amount of supplementary income and therefore I think that this tends to be a disincentive. Now I think people will argue, well you shouldn't think of the amount of money you are going to earn when you come into the Legislature, this shouldn't be a concern, and I guess it isn't a concern for most people who've come into the Legislature or who want to come into the Legislature. They come because they're concerned about implementing one set of policies or other. They want to do this for the farming community or they want to do that for the working man, or they want to do this with education or they want to do that with the health system, and that's fine. Most of us are concerned with these basic policies and we appeal to the electorate based on our particular views. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I don't think society is well served by underpaying members of the Legislature, causing them, for whatever reason, to be unsatisfied and perhaps even after getting a few years experience, wanting to leave because they simply can't afford to stay any longer.

I know many many good people, people in business, people in the professions, who just laugh at you when you ask them if they're ever interested in coming into politics. Why go into politics? Among other things, as the Minister has just said, it interrupts your career. It may be very very difficult to get back onto any career path after being in public life for awhile, and this is very sad.

I'd like to make another observation, Mr. Speaker, and that is comparing the pay of a political person versus the pay of a civil servant. There's no question that if you took a young man or a young woman and you saw him or her come into the Legislature and serve for a period of years, and take another person who might serve, same age, same background, same training, same education, in the Civil Service, I would daresay, Mr. Speaker, that given the same talent, the same dedication, etc., that the person who goes into the Civil Service does a hell of a lot better than the person who goes into the political arena, because

that person not only gets remuneration but also gets some security and a lot of satisfaction as well. I say, there's no question that today, let's face it, the bureaucrats — and I'm not using that term in a demeaning sense — the people who work in the bureaucracy, the people who work in the organization, relatively speaking, are better paid and indeed, I would suggest, if we look very closely at government, this is where a lot of the power lies.

Let's face it, the people of Manitoba, in my view, would be far better served if we had full-time members of this Legislature. I don't mean that we would sit 12 months of the year, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's time that we consider two sessions a year and where we consider that the people who come in here should more or less be full-time people, and that they dedicate themselves to careful scrutiny of spending, that they dedicate themselves to careful scrutiny of legislation. I think, by and large, whatever side of the political fence you're on, you'll see better legislation and you'll see the taxpayer, I believe, will get a better deal for his money; a better deal for the amount of money that's paid to keep a Legislature operating. I think that when I was Minister, I indeed appreciated the scrutiny in estimates of members of the opposition. That may sound sort of queer but I did, because it put . . . The Minister doesn't know everything that goes on in his department and the bigger the department the less the Minister is likely to even appreciate, and some very incisive questions asked by members of the opposition certainly can help the Minister himself deal and cope with his department. I mean if the Minister comes in and doesn't learn anything from the questioning of the opposition, I say that that Minister is missing a bet.

I say, Mr. Speaker, therefore, we'd be better off if we had full-time MLAs. I would like to see better secretarial staff, better secretarial service, better research staff and again, I think, we would have better legislation. We've had some examples in the session where we've seen some deficiencies. I'm trying to discuss this in an unpolitical way and let's face it, we're all human and we make mistakes. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if we did have adequate facilities and if you did expect the MLA to be a full-time position, I think that in the long long run you would get better scrutiny of both spending and legislation and, ultimately, we would all be better off.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into the debate of what's an adequate amount; I mean you can go on forever, it's a matter of judgement. So I say I support the legislation in general. I don't buy the argument that we should leave it till after the election because during the election this will never be initiated. When we have elections, they're over something far more fundamental and far more important than this. They're over very basic issues, very basic issues, in whatever area, natural resource development, agricultural development, education and so on. In fact I would suggest that if a member or a would-be member or a candidate would say, if you let me, I promise to serve for no money, I doubt very much whether he or she will get one extra vote on that account; that if you elect me, I will serve for absolutely . . . Or even lets go one further: You elect all our party, we won't even take any pay; we'll contribute something to the kitty; we'll contribute to

the treasury, if you elect us, you know, we're so magnanimous and we're so altruistic. I don't think that will wash with the people of Manitoba. It will not wash with the electorate. It is not a major issue and I do agree, when the people of Manitoba examine this issue and look at it, I think they're prepared to be fair and they want to see their members and their Cabinet Ministers fairly paid. There is no question. It's ridiculous for the Cabinet Ministers of Manitoba, I don't care which party, to get paid what they're getting paid today. It's absolutely ridiculous for a Cabinet Minister to be paid . . . And in some departments dozens upon dozens of people who have lesser responsibility are getting paid far more than that Minister and indeed, who have a lot more security. Not all have security, maybe a Deputy Minister doesn't have as much security, but the bulk of the Civil Service can feel a lot more secure in their position than the politician.

Usually in this world we trade off income for security. You take a high-risk job and for that high risk and maybe shortness of the possibility of working, you settle for a high income, or you take . . . It used to be, you go into the Civil Service, you get all the security and you take a low income. Well, today, Mr. Speaker, this has changed. In the political arena that we have, we not only have the high risk, no security, and we have the relatively low income. It's in the bureaucracy that you have the high income and the security. I think there's something wrong with that. And I've said this, I've said this long before I ever thought of getting into politics, that it's quite obvious that the gravity of decision making, the centre of gravity of decision making, the power has slipped over to the permanent bureaucracy. I say that without any reflexion on any political party, but I say, if the people want to get some of that power back, they'd be better off to pay well for their Cabinet Ministers; they'd be better off to pay well for what I consider to be coming very quickly a full-time job, to pay members a decent remuneration, a decent amount so that they can serve well, even as a backbencher.

Mr. Speaker, I promised to be brief on it and I've spoken much longer than I intended to. I just conclude by saying that I don't consider this to be a matter of political philosophical difference. I support the bill because I believe that members should be better paid than they are and I'm quite prepared to let the electors in my riding decide whether they want to keep me, regardless of other issues, decide whether they think I'm worth being here in office. That's up to them to decide, but I make no bones about; for some people it may be very unpopular to get up and say and take the position that I'm taking, but I feel very strongly about it and I think that I'm quite prepared to be judged by anyone in the electorate on this particular matter.

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

MR. USKIW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that if you check the records, I think you will find that right back to 1966, whenever this question came up in this Assembly, that I have always taken the position that I didn't want to grandstand or play the political game on this issue, and that even if I

wasn't sure as to the worthiness or otherwise of the increase from time to time, that I felt that it would look somewhat hypocritical if one was to consistently oppose a measure to increase one's own salary, recognizing that there is no other body that can do that very thing, other than the members themselves. Mr. Speaker, I've always taken that position very consistently and I think today is my first departure from that. I regret that I have to depart from that practice, Mr. Speaker. I regret that I have to depart from that and I do so, Mr. Speaker, only because I know the reason that we have a substantial increase proposed this year is in order to catch up on the shortfall of 1977 and the freeze in 1978, over which I know the First Minister received an awful lot of bad commentary from his backbenchers at that particular time, Mr. Speaker. And so this is the catch-up year and not only is it a catch-up year, the Premier is going to make up to his colleagues by giving them a little bonus additional, and that really is what this exercise is all about, Mr. Speaker.

If we had left the old formula in place, we would be almost where we are going to end up, after this bill is passed, Mr. Speaker. So I believe that that is the proof of the pudding, Mr. Speaker, that that is in fact what is taking place.

I know that one could draw all sorts of analogies as to why the members should not have an increase. I think we can talk about, as did the Member for St. Boniface, the government's posture on other people, the restraint program, the minimum wage program, but, Mr. Speaker, I think in the final analysis, in normal circumstances, I believe that I would feel that I was posturing and that I was not credible on this issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are in a position where the Premier wants to make up to his colleagues for having held them back, for having restrained for two years in a row or two sessions. He is going to catch up this year. He wanted to catch up his own position. I don't fault him for that, Mr. Speaker, it's probably long overdue. I can't argue against the proposition that Cabinet Ministers should earn more money than they were up until this point in time. It's true that the Cabinet salaries were at a freeze since 1966. Duff Roblin was the Premier at that time, and that was the last time that there was a Cabinet Minister's increase.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when we became the government, a year after we took a decrease in Cabinet Minister's take-home pay. This is something that perhaps is not known to many members, and I don't know if the front bench there is aware of that. But, Mr. Speaker, up until 1970 there was a provision under The Federal Income Tax Act that provided for a tax-free allowance for Cabinet Ministers, and I believe it was about 2,200 of your Cabinet Minister's salary was the tax-free portion. You know, at a 40 or 50 percent tax bracket you're talking about a loss of about 1,000, give or take a few dollars, when that provision was removed by the Government of Canada, and that took place in about 1970, Mr. Speaker. So there was an actual Cabinet Ministers' salary reduction, in terms of take-home pay, that did take place about a year after we became the government.

No one made anything of it, Mr. Speaker. I know that it occurred because I know that we were

disallowed, after the first time, to make that claim. There was some argument between the Department of Finance here and the federal income tax people in Ottawa. But the federal income tax people's position prevailed, and we were out every since, and so have members opposite who are sitting in the front bench have had to accept that situation, an actual reduction of salary from what it was in 1969; no question about that. So I am not going to put the proposition forward that Cabinet Ministers are not worth the increase, I believe that the former Premier was probably a bit chintzy about it, there is no question about that; about his own salary, about the Cabinet Ministers, notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one could have made many arguments for adjustment. But, Mr. Speaker, it's not my role today to address members on Cabinet Ministers salaries, other than in passing. I simply want to reiterate that I will be breaking tradition this time, my own tradition, on this question only because I believe that the Premier got himself into this problem; I think he has to get himself out of it. I don't think he needs my assistance, Mr. Speaker, I don't think he needs my assistance and, Mr. Speaker, I wish to maintain a degree of credibility. And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the measure, for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, but that doesn't mean that I wouldn't have recognized the need for incremental increases year after year, as was the case, which would have resulted in virtually the same amount of dollars had the system not been tampered with.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I sense that we're reaching the end of this debate and very shortly members will stand up and vote either for or against this bill. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that most of the members on that side will support the bill and that most of the members on this side will vote against it. But those members who will not be following that are in a position to speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, since I will not be voting against the bill, I feel I have to stand up and say a few words on my own personal circumstances and why I am reaching this decision.

Mr. Speaker, it was suggested by one or two members that any increase in this particular bill not come into effect until the next election. Let me say, in reply to that, that I was aware when I ran for election in 1977 what the indemnity was for that year. I was also aware, because it was down in statute, what the amount of the indexing was to be in the future years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister changed the rules halfway through. We could no longer be sure, exactly, or even approximately, what the increases were to be because the First Minister had frozen the indemnities in 1978. That has already been referred to as grandstanding, and I believe it was; I believe it was rather a petty and rather shoddy thing to do at that time, to change the rules for those members who were relying so much on their indemnity. For I, Mr. Speaker, am one of those members who have been

referred to a full-time MLA, my indemnity is my only source of income.

The amounts have been referred to. Let me just review them for members. The actual amounts for 1978 and 1979 were 12,200 and 13,200, in round figures, Mr. Speaker. Had there been no freeze put into effect, the amounts would have been 12,900 and 13,900, for a difference of 1,500.00. So what the members of the House lost by the First Minister's grandstanding for those two years was 1,500.00.

It has been somewhat offset by the amounts that we can calculate for this year. If Bill 48 should go through, I calculate that the amount to be received by MLAs this year on their indemnity will be 15,879.00. Mr. Speaker, had there been no freeze in effect, the amount for this year would have been 14,800, again in round figures, for a grand total for the three years in question of being an actual 41,300, and if the freeze had not been in effect, 41,800.00. So even with the move of the First Minister to correct that error that he made two years ago, we're still 500 worse off, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard various amounts bandied around in the House this evening and there have been references made to a third of the indemnities being tax free. I see very often the press and other outsiders referring to the incomes of MLAs as being around 20,000, and of Cabinet Ministers some 35,000.00. Mr. Speaker, that is incorrect. Members can look in the Act and they will find that the indemnity that was paid to MLAs last year was 13,200, again in round figures. It is not to be confused with an amount of some 6,700, which is for expenses. I understand that it was done in that manner because of a difficulty in actually identifying what is a legitimate expense for a member and what is not; and that to avoid any argument that formula was arrived at, which is quite general, of an amount equal to 50 percent of the indemnity, which will be considered as expenses, and like other expenses or like expenses received by everyone else, it is not subject to income tax.

So, Mr. Speaker, the indemnity that was paid to members of the Legislature, that I received last year, was in the neighbourhood of 13,200.00. Well, Mr. Speaker, frankly I cannot bring up a family of two teenagers and a young daughter, pay a mortgage, run a household, on 13,200.00. So what the effect is, in my particular case, is that I must use part of that 6,700, which is obviously paid to me to carry out the responsibilities in my constituency, in order to live on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat embarrassed about admitting that, but it is a fact that money that is paid to me for the expenses of providing services to my constituency, I use to live on.

There is another amount of some 900 last year that was paid to members and called a constituency allowance. That has never been defined as to what a constituency allowance is, or what it is for. It obviously will not maintain a constituency office. There was some suggestion when it was brought in that it was intended to be paid to rural members to help offset the cost of travelling the larger distances throughout their constituencies. However, it is also paid to urban members and it certainly doesn't cost me an additional 900 in gasoline to drive around my constituency, which is relatively small. So not having

a particular designated use for that 900, I will admit that I use it to feed my family and clothe my family and to pay the mortgage, Mr. Speaker. It does not make me proud to admit that, but it happens to be a fact. I cannot bring up my family on 13,200, and it's for that reason that I am prepared to support this bill.

It will mean, I understand, an income for an MLA of 15,800 this year. Whether or not I can live on that amount and bring up my family, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. Perhaps if we have this same debate in a year's time, I can advise members at that time.

I will not object if this matter of members' indemnities should become an issue at the next election; I will not feel at all embarrassed to tell my constituents that I voted for this increase; I will not feel at all embarrassed to tell them that they, and the other residents of this province, are paying me 15,800, and I don't believe that it will be begrudged of them to me either.

As far as the other matters in the bill are concerned, particularly that of the Cabinet Ministers, that is the Cabinet's responsibility. They set that by Order-in-Council; they will stand responsible for that; they do not come to the House to ask our permission for it, and it is not in Bill 48. So I, for one, am in a position to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we have had the benefit of advice from some of the honourable members opposite and some of the members of the government, and the backbench, on this bill. There is not too much to which I feel need to respond tonight because the report of Mr. Justice Hall has been, I think, largely ignored in the debate that we have heard thus far. What happened was that Mr. Justice Hall was asked to make a recommendation to the Cabinet and to the Legislature of Manitoba with respect to the salaries of members of the Legislature and of the Executive Council and those holding offices in this House. The recommendations are clear. The bill that is before the House now for second reading is based upon the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Hall.

The fact that an indemnity of say, 1,000 was paid in 1977, at the time of the special session, that was brought on not by the actions of this government or indeed by the opposition, is really irrelevant to the discussion here today, notwithstanding all of the heated remarks that we have heard from the other side of the House. The fact that my honourable friends put in an escalator which accounts for something like an 8 percent increase, I think it is, this year, is again irrelevant because Mr. Justice Hall took account of that fact as he was comparing the relative indemnities of members of the Legislature of this province compared with other provinces, particularly Saskatchewan. I am not one who, for a moment, would say that any member of this House is worth five cents more than any other member of a Legislature of any other province of the country but I do believe that each of us, with the duties that we perform, whether in government or in opposition, is worth, in terms of the indemnity that we receive,

something averaging what is paid across Canada, is a reasonable and a just approach. And that, as I deduce it, is the recommendation of Mr. Justice Hall in his report; that, as I deduce it, is what is the recommendation contained in the bill that is before us. I will dismiss as being irrelevant all of the comments that we have heard about mendacity, about hypocrisy, all of the other rhetorical words that have been used in this debate about low grade politics on the part of the government and so on. Really, I don't think that any of those things are really terribly relevant to the public service and to those who serve, all 57 of the members of this House who serve in the Public Service at the highest level in this province, and that is what we're dealing with tonight. There was some comment made about resenting of grandstanding. That type of comment, I think, deserves really no response because there has been no grandstanding with respect to this matter at all.

There was a report commissioned by the government; the report has been received; the report has now been acted upon. I think it is a fair and a just and a reasonable report and any members opposite, or any members behind me, who choose to feel that this increase in the indemnity that is being accorded by this bill to the members of the Legislature, need not accept it. They can publicly or privately or in whatever way they wish, refuse it. But I say, Mr. Speaker, and I've said it before and I make no imputations with respect to any member of this House who has spoken on this bill. It is one thing to speak against the bill. It is another thing to stand up before the paymaster at the end of the session and take the pay that results from the bill. And I merely say to those members who say vociferously that they oppose the bill, then let them have the courage of their conscience not to accept what comes from the bill. There's a well known word in the Anglo-Saxon lexicon which may not appeal to the Member for St. Johns or others who are temperamentally opposed to things like that, there's a well known word, and that is "hypocrisy", and I'm not accusing any member, I'm not accusing any member of this House of hypocrisy at all. But I say that if you're feeling is so strong as has been expressed, I am sure, by some members tonight, about members of this House not receiving further indemnity with respect to their service in this House which would raise them to fifth in the country, on average, then I say that you have a completely free option open to you, and that is not to accept it. But don't on the one hand stand up and say, I think it is wrong to move that the members of the House should have this kind of an increase and then turn around, and with the right hand out, and nudge other people out of line to receive it, because that is what we have seen on too many other occasions in this House and we will all be watching.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately last year I was not present in the declining days of the debate when the pension bill was before the House with respect to the changes in the pension law for the members of this Legislature, but I heard and I read some of the comments that were made at that time. I do not intend, tonight, because I do not think it would be necessarily proper, although the public record is available for those who wish to see it, I do not intend tonight, to suggest that those who spoke most

vehemently against the increase in pensions for the members last year were perhaps among those who had their first applications in to receive the benefits of those pensions after the bill was passed. So no one, Mr. Speaker, and I've tried to keep this on a non-partisan and a non-personal basis — (Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the member for St. Johns says high level. That's a level with which he is totally unfamiliar. For his whole lifetime he's been unfamiliar with anything at a high level of debate. All I can say is the talk of mendacity, talk of hypocrisy on the part of the opposition, talk of low-grade politics, talk of grandstanding, talk of no increments received by the members of the Cabinet during the years, as the Member for Inkster mentioned, when the former Premier of this province was in charge of things he valued, apparently, and placed some value on the fact that he was the lowest paid Premier in Canada and I'm not going to make the response to that comment that is perhaps deserved.

But I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard all of these comments before. I heard in part the remarks of the Member for St. Boniface tonight and the remarks of the Member for St. Boniface have changed very little from what they were 15 years ago when he opposed the pension bill that was brought in at that time by the late Maitland Steinkopf, the provincial secretary at the time, and opposed most vehemently by the Member for St. Boniface, who, as I recall, and I'm subject to correct and subject to apology, was one of the first to apply, after the pension provisions became law, for the benefit of those pension provisions.

And I merely say to the people of Manitoba, not to my honourable friends opposite, that judge the members, judge the speeches of the members on this side of the House, and on that side of the House, on the basis of what they do. If they believe what they say then they won't take the increases. If they don't believe what they say, then they will take the increases and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of . . . I don't wish to use the word "privilege" because then you'll insist that I make some type of substantive motion. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The First Minister has referred in blanket form to those who spoke against the pension increase being first in line. Mr. Speaker, I believe I was one who spoke against the retroactivity of the pension. At considerable loss to myself, the Minister will have to confirm that I was not in line for making that retroactive pension available to myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would be the first in the House to accept the word of the Honourable Member for Inkster with respect to what he has just said. His word is inviolate in this House and I would accept it without question.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. GREEN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is second reading, Bill 48, The Legislative Assembly Act.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Boyce, Brown, Cosens, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Filmon, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen, Walding, Wilson.

NAYS

Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Domino, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Miller, Schroeder, Uruski, Uskiw, Mrs. Westbury.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 31; Nays, 16.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

THIRD READING

BILLS 15, 68 and 89 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, would you call for third reading, Bill Nos. 67, 68 and 100?

BILL NO. 67 THE MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River) presented Bill No. 67, An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 100 — AN ACT RESPECTING THE ASSESSMENT OF PROPERTY FOR TAXATION IN MUNICIPALITIES IN 1981 AND 1982

MR. GOURLAY presented Bill No. 100, An Act respecting the Assessment of Property for Taxation in Municipalities in 1981 and 1982, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON THIRD READING

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on Page 2, Adjourned Debates on Third Reading, would you call Bills No. 19, 23, 39, 76, 84 and 94?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, the Honourable Member for St. Vital. (Stands)

BILL NO. 23 AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEY FOR CAPITAL PURPOSES AND AUTHORIZE THE BORROWING OF THE SAME

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 23 — the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say on this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Stands)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 76, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill. Stand?

MR. JENKINS: May I have this matter stand? (Stands)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 84, The Lotteries and Gaming Control Act.
The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Stands)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 94 — the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Stands)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 60 under Third Readings, Amended Bills?

THIRD READING — AMENDED BILLS

BILLS NO. 60 AND 82 were each read and third time and adjourned.

**BILL NO. 101
AN ACT TO AMEND
THE PLANNING ACT**

BILL 101 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 30, The Canadian Institute of Management (Manitoba Division) Act, standing in the name of Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Stands)

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 55?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 55, adjourned debate on second reading, An act to Incorporate The Brandon University Foundation.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have this matter stand? (Stands)

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 o'clock this morning. (Wednesday)