



Fifth Session- Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report  
(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Louise M. Dacquay  
Speaker*



**Vol. XLIX No. 13B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, April 22, 1999**

ISSN 0542-5492

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise, Hon.	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary	Concordia	N.D.P.
DOWNEY, James	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Steinbach	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	N.D.P.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane	Osborne	N.D.P.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn	St. James	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
NEWMAN, David, Hon.	Riel	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank, Hon.	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack, Hon.	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley, Hon.	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupert's Island	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Gladstone	P.C.
SALE, Tim	Crescentwood	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	N.D.P.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
TOEWS, Vic, Hon.	Rossmere	P.C.
TWEED, Mervin, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	N.D.P.
<i>Vacant</i>	St. Boniface	

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 22, 1999

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

#### Earth Day

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Environment):** I am rising today on the occasion of Earth Day. This event is being celebrated around the world to remind us that our natural environment is fundamental to our quality of life and indeed to our very existence.

When the first Earth Day was held almost 30 years ago, it was held less as a celebration than a protest, a protest at the time against the obvious degradation of the environment that was occurring around us. It was part of a movement that ultimately led to the creation of the institutions and the laws that safeguard our environment today.

This coming Sunday at The Forks, Manitobans will have the opportunity to come together to celebrate our own made-in-Manitoba Earth Day. Our own Fort Whyte nature centre has been instrumental in organizing Manitoba's Earth Day. It is a very fitting role for this world-renowned environmental education centre. Fort Whyte's participation in the events of the day will emphasize that we have come a long way in our environmental actions and thinking.

Fort Whyte itself is a case in point, Madam Speaker. They have turned abandoned gravel pits and wasteland into a world-class environmental education centre which has influenced the environmental awareness of a generation of Manitobans. They have undertaken the restoration of tall grass prairie lands and they are involved in the innovative reclamation of an old industrial site in Transcona. They are striving to make every day Earth Day.

The first Earth Day marked just the start of the awareness and involvement for many. Today in Manitoba it marks the celebration of a very high-level awareness and involvement in environmental issues. Over the past several years literally thousands of young people have been involved in environmental projects through the Manitoba Youth Corps, the Manitoba Green Team, and our schools are encouraging and sponsoring a wide variety of environmental activities. Environment and sustainable development is an accepted part of our schools' curriculum. Tens of thousands of school children visit facilities like Fort Whyte and Oak Hammock Marsh each year to learn about their environment and what they can do to help preserve it.

Madam Speaker, we have had to learn that there are limits to the stresses we can put on the environment, limits that only became apparent as our populations and economies grew. Our children, on the other hand, are learning about the concepts of ecology and stewardship at an early age. Environmental stewardship is for many of them a fundamental part of their value system.

So we celebrate. We also have a time of introspection to ask ourselves what more needs to be done and what challenges lie ahead. We have done much to promote the principles of sustainable development, but we still have a long way to go before sustainable development becomes second nature in everything that we Manitobans do.

Many of our challenges are external—climatic change and other issues of that sort, greenhouse gas emissions. All of these are things that will require fundamental shifts in the way we do things in our society. So let us celebrate Earth Day, because we have come a long way in the past 30 years, and indeed we do have much to celebrate. Let us remind ourselves that this is a work in progress and that we must now apply the lessons we have learned from our

past successes to meet larger challenges in the future. Thank you.

\* (1335)

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the minister's statement on Earth Day.

Earth Day is the day that we recognize the importance of maintaining the quality of our air, land, and water, and the key element of that is public participation in decision making, in a statement from a government that has cut funding to the Department of Environment by \$5 million since it was elected, 1988, a government that we do not know where the status of the Household Hazardous Waste Program is. I raised the issue earlier on this week with the minister with on off, on off. Individuals out there are doing the responsible thing. They are collecting their household hazardous waste—paints, solvents. They do not know what to do with them, because the minister has yet to come forward to make a statement about that.

Manitobans are paying a two-cent environmental levy on containers, and now currently the government has about seven or so—maybe even higher—million dollars in that fund. Yet, there are still Manitobans who do not receive recycling opportunities in this province. This is a government that used the Sustainable Development Innovations Fund as a political slush fund, where 90 percent of the grants went to projects in Conservative ridings, a government that never once supported any of our private members' resolutions on this side of the House pertaining to the improvement of our environment. This is what we have from the members opposite.

Earlier today, I had a chance to take part in an event in my constituency where a group of students, along with their teachers, reclaimed a portion of their school yard, and they were turning it into tall grass prairie. They put aside a part of the project to grow vegetables for the Selkirk Food Bank. This, to me, is what Earth Day is all about. It is about grassroot action to protect and to save our environment. Thank you very much.

### Littleton, Colorado, Tragedy

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Education and Training):** Madam Speaker, I have a brief statement for the House.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the senseless deaths of 14 students and one teacher at a high school in Littleton, Colorado. As a parent, my heart goes out to the staff and the students, family members and friends who are struggling to come to grips with this most unfortunate tragedy. We tend to look upon our schools as safe havens for our children. When we send our children out the door each morning we hope that they will be nurtured, challenged and stimulated and come home a little wiser each day, but the life lessons doled out in Littleton are the types of lessons we hope our children never have to learn.

The tragedy of Littleton, Colorado, is one that we do not wish to see repeated anywhere. We must come up with strategies to prevent these types of incidents from happening. We much reach out to our children, our families and our friends when they are in need. The events at Littleton, Colorado, cause us to pause and think about how much we cherish our families and our friends and how important it is to listen to and to be aware of the feelings of others. We must be aware of subtle signals others send out, signals that may indicate they want us to reach out and help them. We must answer that call. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

\* (1340)

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** Madam Speaker, perhaps I will just repeat some of the comments that I made yesterday in Members' Statements. I think it is important to begin by acknowledging that when a family sees a child off to school, they expect that child to spend the day learning and growing and building a stronger future, and to instead come to grips with the eradication of a future at school is one of the most troubling events that can transpire. As I said yesterday, the only good that can come from such a horror is it gives us the opportunity to re-examine not just our personal behaviour perhaps

as parents, perhaps as mentors, but it does provide us an opportunity to re-examine our systems, how we collectively deal with challenges in the community, and it allows us to re-examine our social development as a community.

I note that it was the Minister of Education who made the statement. Just to draw on that for a moment, we indeed have to make every effort to ensure that our schools are safe places for learning, but at the same time we must recognize that the scourge of violence and hatred is not bred in the schools but is brought in from outside. At the same time we all must also recognize that schools can be a greater part of the solution through such programs as nonviolent conflict resolution programs. We are seeing conflict mediators in the school grounds. We are seeing restorative justice programs develop in our schools. We are seeing safe school policies initiated through consultations with the students, the greater community, parent councils, educators and administrators, and we have, I think, some good models to go forward on, not just where nonviolence and tolerance and respect are taught but where it is indeed practised.

Madam Speaker, to go outside of the school to where indeed the hatred and the violence are bred is the greater challenge. I think it is incumbent on each of us as community leaders in our own way, those in positions of authority, to question how we can deal with those big issues out there. I cannot help but think of how we must re-evaluate the virtually unchecked growth explosion, if you will, of a violent, popular culture. It is a popular culture characterized by the glorification of violent so-called heroes in movies, of video games that actually enlist children in violence against human characters. As I said yesterday, the sanctity of human life is therefore relegated, denigrated to mere body counts in movies, on television or to a score in a video game.

It is hard here in Manitoba, one relatively small jurisdiction, to do something about that, but now is the time to think about what we can do. Closer to home, we know how important it is to constantly re-evaluate our responses to violence in the home through our policies

regarding domestic violence, for example, how well we learn from past tragedies, even in this jurisdiction. We must re-evaluate how we deal both on the prevention and the suppression side of violent gang activity, and we must re-evaluate how well we deal with the challenge of youth despair.

In this province where we suffer record levels of youth despair, if you rely on the measurements that are available to us, whether it is violent youth crime—I understand the largest increase in violent youth crime in Canada, the province's—we look at the teenage suicide rates, and we look at risk factors such as the rate of children in care, the rate of teenage pregnancy, Manitoba is not faring well. So we have work to do.

I will conclude with yesterday's comments that, while we indeed mourn the loss that this tragedy has brought, we also hope that from this school in Colorado some most profound and unintended lessons will be taught and that in some way we will progress. Thank you.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, I would ask for leave just to add a few words in regard to this issue.

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable member for Inkster have leave to make comment on the ministerial statement? [agreed]

**Mr. Lamoureux:** It is indeed something that I think has touched the hearts and souls of individuals young and old from coast to coast on this particular continent. It is a very sad occasion and a lot to be learned by it. In fact, we should never believe that an incident of this nature could never happen north of the United States. We can recall a number of years back where there was a student that was killed in a high school situation in Sturgeon Creek. It happened some 15, 20 years ago.

\* (1345)

When we think of our schools, we like to believe that these are safe and secure premises, that they are there for our young people to learn, to challenge their abilities from an educational standpoint. I think that all of our hearts and

condolences would go to the families and friends and all the young people who were so dramatically affected. What we have seen through the media has had an impact on people here in Manitoba. You listen to radio shows or you read newspapers or get commentaries from television, you will see young people who have been torn apart and do not know what to think. It goes right to our seniors, that whole element of fear.

Hopefully all of us, as legislators, will gain something from this tragic occurrence and see the importance of doing what we can to provide that safe and secure atmosphere so our children feel safe in our public and private schools. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable Minister of Finance, with a ministerial statement.

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Finance):** No, I have some tablings.

#### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Finance):** I would like to table the following, which have already been distributed: The Manitoba Foundation Annual Report; Supplementary Loan and Guarantee Authority Report; the Manitoba Hospital Capital Financing Authority Auditor's Report; Debt Retirement Fund Annual Report; and the Enabling Appropriations and Other Appropriations Annual Report.

**Hon. Mervin Tweed (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** I am pleased to table the following '97-98 annual reports from the Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism, copies of which reports having been previously distributed: the Annual Report for Manitoba Industry, Trade and Tourism; Annual Report for the Cooperative Promotion Board; Annual Report for the Co-operative Loans and Loans Guarantee Board; Annual Report for the Manitoba Development Corporation; Annual Report for Manitoba Trade; Annual Report for Industrial Technology Centre; and the Annual Report for Economic Innovation and Technology Council.

#### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have this afternoon fifteen Grade 5 students from Archwood School under the direction of Mrs. Connie Stanley. This school is located in the constituency of St. Boniface.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you this afternoon.

\* (1350)

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Home Care Workers Marketing—Personal Care Homes

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon): is there a policy on home care staff being asked to recruit people to be placed in private profit supportive housing in Manitoba?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I am just trying to understand the question from the Leader of the Opposition. A policy on home care workers for placements in private home care arrangements—I am assuming from his question he is suggesting that home care workers who basically work for the provincially funded home care system basically through organizations like the Winnipeg Community and Long Term Care Authority are providing those services. We all know that there are some private sector companies that provide some service enhancements to individuals who need home care services, but certainly there is significant support from the provincially funded Home Care program which in last year's budget was \$123 million. In fact, some additional expenditures were provided in this budget year, '98-99. So actually the Home Care program is significantly greater than the \$123 million. Certainly it is a very comprehensive program meeting the needs of individuals requiring home care in the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Doer:** We have heard from a number of home care staff that there has been an attempt

now to use the home care office—and we have a memo from the director of home care indicating that it expected that appropriate clients will be called to hear more information about the Rosewood centre. All clients on their caseload are to be called and identified, and pamphlets are to be sent now to, quote, customers. Rosewood Village centre is owned by KPCC Management; its rents are between \$1,375 and \$1,975 per month. It is a private profit firm. Is it appropriate that provincially funded people are being asked to review files and recruit people and hand out pamphlets to "customers" for this private profit centre?

**Mr. Stefanson:** Well, again, we have an extremely comprehensive Home Care program in Manitoba. In fact last year nationally, it was recognized as the most comprehensive Home Care program in all of Canada. I have already indicated financially last year's budget, \$123 million, in fact, a greater amount than \$123 million being spent in 1998-99. We will wait for our upcoming budget in terms of the allocation for Home Care in the upcoming year. So, again, the program that is funded and run through the Winnipeg Community and Long Term Care Authority through the RHAs is funded significantly by the taxpayers of Manitoba, by the provincial government.

In terms of the some of the facilities the member is referring to, I believe home care services certainly are available from the publicly funded Home Care program. Individuals do have an opportunity to access private home care over and above or under different situations than the provincially funded program if they deem that that is required. But certainly the provincially funded program is extremely comprehensive. In fact, most would suggest it is the most comprehensive in all of Canada.

**Mr. Doer:** That is certainly what we argued when this minister was responsible for Treasury Board, and along with the former Minister of Health they tried to privatize the most comprehensive system in Canada. I am glad they have a pre-election conversion on the road to Damascus on this issue, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the minister indicated that home care is paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba. Is it appropriate that the taxpayers of

Manitoba pay for publicly funded home care staff to be located at the Rosewood centre for purposes of this recruitment drive to this private profit centre?

\* (1355)

**Mr. Stefanson:** Again, Madam Speaker, if individuals are assessed as being allowed to access the Home Care program in any given facility, we continue, and I am sure the Home Care program run by the WCA and the RHAs continue to look at the most efficient and effective way to provide that home care, and they will make the decision. If a given facility has a certain number of home care clients, so to speak, where it is more efficient to provide that through the individual being accessible right in that facility, that might very well be the most efficient way to provide that home care as opposed to having a number of home care workers coming into any given facility. So certainly, as much as we are proud of the fact that we have the most comprehensive program in all of Canada—we have tripled the home care budget in Manitoba since 1988—it certainly is incumbent on the organization and the program to always look at the most efficient and effective way to provide those very important services.

I know that is a concept that is awfully difficult for members opposite to understand, but it is incumbent on the people providing that service to always do it as efficiently and effectively as possible.

#### **Home Care Workers Marketing—Personal Care Homes**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Health. I have spoken with home care workers who never in the past were told that they had to go marketing for a private company to try to fill up spaces. Never before has a memo gone out from the director of home care to workers saying that they should phone their client list, put a record on their client list whether or not the person wants to go to the Rosewood and, quote, hand out pamphlets to potential customers where possible. That is, potential customers who are home care clients.

My question to the Minister of Health is: will you order today your home care co-ordinators and workers to stop marketing for the Rosewood home?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, I certainly would be interested in the member tabling the document that he referred to.

I would think he would accept that if people go into the Rosewood facility and they are entitled to home care in Manitoba, Madam Speaker, they should receive home care in Manitoba. It is only members opposite who would support a system that would have a number of home care workers going into any one facility if you can do it more efficiently by having a single home care worker providing those services in any given facility.

So, again, I am certainly interested in the member tabling whatever information it is he has, but certainly if people in any given facility are entitled to home care in Manitoba, it is certainly incumbent on all of us to provide that home care.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, would the minister not agree that with respect to personal care homes, an individual has a choice of going to three personal care homes? You are given that option and you are not pressured. But with respect to the new sort of quasi-marketing program under home care, home care workers are phoning clients and asking them, giving them pamphlets to a particular private facility and asking them. Will the minister not admit that that is wrong?

**Mr. Stefanson:** Again, I mean, if it is a matter of making individuals aware of what services are available to them if they meet the criteria, I would think that that is something that members opposite would support in terms of heightening awareness of individuals if they are in a facility that they also would be—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I am experiencing difficulty hearing the honourable Minister of Health.

**Mr. Stefanson:** Madam Speaker, in terms of making sure that individuals are aware that they can access home care, obviously if they meet certain criteria—and the objective is also to provide that home care service in as efficient and effective way as possible throughout all of our facilities and throughout the entire program.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, I will table the directive that has gone out from home care to its staff. I would like to ask the minister to explain why staff were asked to phone all the clients. They could not fill up the Rosewood. Now the criteria have been relaxed to try to fill up the Rosewood, and you have home care staff literally phoning their clients, marking on the assessment forms whether they want to go to the Rosewood or not, which is wrong, and giving the pamphlets to the, quote, customers to get them to go to the Rosewood, a private, for-profit facility that has been erected. Is this not wrong? Will the minister not stop it today?

**Mr. Stefanson:** Madam Speaker, I certainly repeat what I have already said to members opposite. We have the most comprehensive Home Care program in all of Canada.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Stefanson:** Madam Speaker, as I have indicated, we have the most comprehensive Home Care Program in all of Canada. The budget for our Home Care program has been tripled in the last 10 years alone. It is now over \$123 million. There is a set of criteria that individuals have to meet to qualify for home care, and certainly I would hope members opposite are not suggesting for a minute if people meet those criteria that they should not be provided with home care. Obviously they should be. It is also incumbent on the whole organization to continue to do that as efficiently and effectively as possible.



\* (1400)

**Home Care Workers  
Marketing—Personal Care Homes**

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Madam Speaker, will the minister not recognize that this facility is not even open yet and yet he has intake workers sitting in there encouraging people to come and be part of this private sector initiative? His home care director has suggested that every single person must be called, and they must note why they say no, if they say no. I want to quote from the memo: I appreciate the work initially being done, but I feel it is essential that our program be recognized as being supportive and responsive to this initiative.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Will the honourable member please pose his question.

**Mr. Sale:** Madam Speaker, this facility is located in the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) riding. Is the facility getting special treatment because it is located in his riding, special treatment in the form of staff on site and marketing from the—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, there is no special treatment being given in any case here. Again, those kinds of accusations or suggestions coming from the member for Crescentwood are certainly par for the course, and we have grown to expect it, unfortunately, in this House.

We continue to provide a very comprehensive Home Care program in Manitoba. The organizations providing the services, the WCA, the RHAs, continue to look at the most efficient and effective way to do that. It is provided to the individuals in their homes, in their apartments. What we are seeing more and more of across Manitoba today are programs like supportive housing and enriched housing. Certainly a good number of the people in those facilities do qualify for home care, and again, I think it is incumbent to provide that home care as efficiently and effectively as can possibly be done, and we encourage organizations to do that.

**Mr. Sale:** Will the minister recognize that the facility is not even open yet? It is not a question of providing services to which people are entitled.

Will he answer whether or not the facility is getting special treatment because its owners have given a total of \$30,000 to the Conservative Party, including \$3,000 to the Premier's own re-election campaign in 1995?

**Mr. Stefanson:** Well, Madam Speaker, again the member for Crescentwood is up to the usual. At least his Leader has the common good sense to hand it off to the member for Crescentwood, because we are used to this kind of attitude and approach from that member.

Again I repeat, what we are seeing across Manitoba is we are seeing projects of a supportive housing and an enriched housing nature. Go into some of those facilities. Many of the individuals in those facilities are at a stage of life where they qualify for home care services. Again, the objective of many of these initiatives is to provide the services that people are entitled to, to provide the services that they need and to do it as efficiently and effectively as possible. That is certainly the appropriate way to handle home care in Manitoba.

**Mr. Sale:** Madam Speaker, will the minister and his government simply do the right thing and tell the director of home care that she is to tell her staff not to recruit people to live in this home, not to be present during the process of people visiting the place, and, yes, if people live there and they are entitled to home care after the fact, absolutely, but to stop marketing this home through publicly paid civil servants. Let it fail or succeed on its own merits.

**Mr. Stefanson:** Well, I am glad the member for Crescentwood finally acknowledges that if people are entitled to home care services they should be provided. It is certainly encouraging that they have recognized that obvious fact, Madam Speaker. Again, the whole objective of our Home Care program is to provide the services to the people when they need them,

where they need them, and that is continually being done. We have more and more enriched housing projects, supportive housing projects, enriched and supportive housing projects right across Manitoba. Many of the individuals in those homes qualify for home care, and again, the organizations will continue to provide that in an efficient and effective manner.

#### **Lynn Lake Hospital Foundation Accounts**

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Madam Speaker, for more than 50 years Lynn Lake has contributed millions of dollars in provincial taxes. As well, residents have raised more than \$350,000 for the Lynn Lake Hospital Foundation. This government wants that money and moved the hospital bank account, which became a factor in the closure of the Lynn Lake bank.

My question for the Minister of Health is simply this: why should the funds from the Lynn Lake Hospital Foundation not remain entirely for the purposes of the Lynn Lake Hospital, because that is the reason why the funds were raised in the first place?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Well, again, Madam Speaker, I will look into the specifics of the Lynn Lake Hospital.

But certainly with the RHAs in general, funds have been retained in two various accounts, one on the basis of foundations, capital accounts, and the other one on the basis of being able to retain some of the equity in RHAs. So certainly the pattern across Manitoba has been leaving a great deal of those funds in place throughout the regions to provide not only for health care services but in some cases to make contributions to the capital requirements in the health care facilities.

The specifics of Lynn Lake, I will certainly look into.

#### **Lynn Lake Hospital Capital Project—Community Contribution**

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Madam Speaker, could the minister explain why Lynn Lake will be required to raise a portion of any capital renovations to the Lynn Lake Hospital, in

addition to using the hospital foundation money for such renovations?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Again, Madam Speaker, under certain projects—and I would have to look at the particulars of Lynn Lake—there is a community contribution policy in place in Manitoba. There has been a policy of one sort or another in place in Manitoba for many, many years. Other provinces like British Columbia have a 40 percent community contribution requirement; Saskatchewan has a 35 percent community contribution. Here in Manitoba, if a community makes its contribution up front, it is 10 percent; if they do it over 10 years, it is 20 percent interest free.

So again, depending on the nature of the capital project, not all capital projects require a community contribution. Depending on the nature, some of the projects do, and I am certainly prepared to look into the specifics of the Lynn Lake requirements.

#### **Staffing**

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Exactly how long does this minister expect the people of Lynn Lake and surrounding area to wait before personnel shortages at the hospital are filled? The hospital now needs a manager, an X-ray technician, a lab technician and nurses.

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Again, Madam Speaker, right across Manitoba we have made significant improvements in terms of accessing people in our health care system. Certainly when it comes to rural positions, there has been significant improvement in terms of more physicians in rural Manitoba and a number of specialty areas, whether it be anesthetists, oncologists and others. We have made continual improvement in terms of providing more. We certainly do acknowledge that we do need more nurses in Manitoba as does appear to be the case almost right across Canada. We are seeing other provinces under various programs to recruit more nurses.

Certainly for Manitoba there is a need to be recruiting more nurses. That is why we have taken a number of steps. We have established a

\$7-million fund in our province to deal with the issue of recruiting, retaining more nurses in our province. We are continually converting more positions in our health care system to permanent positions. That is what nurses tell us is required to provide the kind of stability that they require. So we are taking a number of steps to provide more nurses right throughout all of Manitoba.

\* (1410)

### **Emerson Health Care Facility Capital Project**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, my question is again for the Minister of Health or as many are becoming to know, the minister of announcements. You know, last week the minister came out with so many announcements, it is called regurgitation—is the term—of announcements.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** As the Leader of the Liberal Party was out in Altona yesterday, representatives or individuals from Emerson were out there, and they were saying for the fourth time it was announced last week that the multimillion dollar health care facility was going to happen in Emerson. Madam Speaker, people want to know are they going to be four times lucky—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster, please pose your question now.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** We are looking to the Minister of Health to acknowledge that it is one thing to make an announcement, it is another thing to actually materialize on an announcement. Four times announcing the same project is not necessarily a positive thing. My question to the Minister of Health is: does this government have any time frame when they are actually going to see some reality as opposed to an

announcement and an announcement and a regurgitation of nothing but failed promises?

**Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Health):** Well, Madam Speaker, I am somewhat bewildered by this question, because all the member needs to do is to drive around Winnipeg or drive outside of Winnipeg to many of our communities, and he will see examples of significant health care projects underway right across the province, whether he goes to Concordia Hospital or he goes to Misericordia Hospital or he goes out to Brandon or he goes to Morden-Winkler, or he goes into a community like Altona. The list goes on and on in terms of significant capital projects that are required here in the province of Manitoba.

I am certainly pleased that my colleague the MLA for Emerson (Mr. Penner) was a part of an announcement on Friday for building a new integrated health centre, including in-patient beds, emergency services, primary community health services and a 30-bed personal care home in Emerson, which is committed to and will be underway very shortly.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Inkster, with a supplementary question.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, one would think the minister of announcements would be around the corner. Maybe there is a possible election or something of that nature.

My question to the minister of announcements/health is: the capital policy, from what I understand, is that there should be 20 percent down or a commitment of up to 20 percent in order to get the capital project up and going. Has the community established that 20 percent, or can the minister enlighten us as to what degree they have come close to the 20 percent?

**Mr. Stefanson:** We have a community contribution policy which, if a community provides the money up front, it is 10 percent of the capital cost. The majority of projects that we have ongoing now, the communities have done it on that kind of a basis, and they are able to provide their support in one of many ways. In

some cases they do direct fundraising; in some cases the municipalities make a contribution; in some cases there is some money left in their trust funds, their foundation funds, for capital projects.

Again, that has not been an impediment to capital projects going forward, in fact, quite the opposite. It has been a very positive part of our projects because it leads to more community involvement, it leads to significantly more review and due diligence on the projects. As a result of that, I believe we are ending up with the absolute most appropriate facilities in each and every case. As well, it includes the regional health authorities and their boards and their support staff.

I remind members opposite that the community contribution requirement in the province of British Columbia is 40 percent, in the province of Saskatchewan, 35 percent. So certainly ours is very reasonable stacked against those two provinces as examples.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Can the Minister of Health tell this House, out of that \$123-million capital project, how much of that has actually been approved through those communities that have actually raised the funds, and how much would just be election hype where they do not actually have the communities on side in terms of commitment to financial obligations?

**Mr. Stefanson:** Madam Speaker, again I just encourage the member to look around this province and see the significant capital improvements in our health care system. I obviously could go on beyond the list I have already mentioned, facilities like Riverview hospital here in the city of Winnipeg, and it goes on and on.

First of all, a number of these projects do not require a community contribution to begin with. Secondly, those that do, I am absolutely confident will all go ahead because to date that has not been an impediment in terms of any projects going ahead. Quite the opposite. It has led to significant community involvement and community contribution.

Going back to the member's first question, I would just encourage him the next time he talks to his Leader, talk to his Leader about the role that the federal government does, and remind his Leader that there is a time to stand up for Manitoba, like he should have been doing when he was a part of the federal Parliament, and he was there when \$260 million each and every year was cut from funding support to the province of Manitoba, but yet we continue to commit hundreds of millions of dollars to needed health care projects right across our entire province.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Yes, Madam Speaker, on a point of order, the Minister of Health knows full well that one should not necessarily be provoking debate. Having said that, given that he was a former Minister of Finance, he should understand that his figures are so far out of the ball park, it is absolutely amazing—\$260 million. Obviously he is living on a totally different planet. In one year, \$260 million?

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I am somewhat confused with the point of order raised by the honourable member for Inkster because I believe the point of order he raised was relative to the minister not provoking debate, but in his own comments, in my opinion, he also invoked debate. So I will therefore rule that there was no point of order.

\* (1420)

### Unemployment Rate—Aboriginals Government Initiatives

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** As we all know, the monthly labour force statistics showing the rate of unemployment in Manitoba excludes people living on reserves in this province and indeed across the country. But we do have information from the 1996 census for aboriginal groups both on and off reserves. If we assume the usual participation rate for Manitoba, we find the unemployment rate for reserves is around 50 percent, and at that I think it is understated, Madam Speaker.

If we look at a cross-section of reserves in this province, we see even higher rates such as

58.9 percent at Fort Alexander and 61.1 percent at Sandy Bay. So, Madam Speaker, in view of the serious economic and social consequences of this unacceptably high unemployment, is the Minister of Finance prepared to face up to this problem in the forthcoming budget and offer new programs that will help reduce unemployment and help these people out of poverty?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Finance):** I know the member knows that the manner in which these statistics are gathered and reported has remained the same as when they were in office. Certainly the unemployment rate was much higher at that time. We are very proud in Manitoba of all of the very positive economic indicators that reflect a very buoyant economy here. Our unemployment rate is at 5.4 percent, the lowest in the country. We have been creating full-time permanent jobs at about 10,000 permanent jobs a year, and all of the economic indicators point to real growth in the province of Manitoba.

I know the member for Brandon East has spoken out against the balanced budget legislation and would prefer to see deficits. I can recall him making speeches that deficits stimulate the economy. Certainly he is out of step with what is going on across this country. We believe in balanced budgets, and I believe, even if he does not, his Leader now believes in balanced budgets, although I know that members of his caucus still speak against it.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Madam Speaker, I am not sure what that answer had to do with my question.

I asked the minister—I want the minister—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable member for Brandon East, with a supplementary question.

**Mr. L. Evans:** I would ask this minister if he would face up to the problem of unemployment among both aboriginal and Metis people living off of the reserves where we find unemployment rates easily three to four times higher than the average for this province. The minister can talk

all he wishes about low unemployment rates, but for this group of people it is absolutely intolerable.

So I am asking the minister: is he prepared to take some concrete steps? We are talking about a budget. We want initiatives. Is he prepared to take this matter seriously and provide, particularly for the unemployed aboriginal and Metis youth, the opportunities that they deserve?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Madam Speaker, certainly we are very pleased that the unemployment rate in Manitoba is the lowest in the country at 5.4 percent, but we are not finished yet. We believe that it will go lower, that there has been—as I have indicated to him—10,000 new, permanent full-time jobs created in the last year and 35,000 new full-time jobs created in the last four years.

The Maple Leaf plant in his backyard in Brandon—actually, it is probably in Minnedosa constituency. I believe that they are taking a very proactive stance. The mayor of Brandon has indicated that they will do everything in their power to create employment for unemployed people in the Brandon area, and that includes any of the citizens who live in that area.

Certainly in our discussions with the federal government, we will raise this issue and have them fulfill whatever commitments they can to create employment for aboriginal people.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Well, Madam Speaker, I ask the minister if he will acknowledge that Canada has transferred all responsibility for employment and training programs to the Province of Manitoba. Will he acknowledge that, and will he acknowledge that we need new employment initiatives in this budget—we are talking about a budget that is supposed to be coming down next week—to provide opportunities for our aboriginal people, opportunities that will enable them to get a job and raise their standard of living? If we look at figures, look at the income figures and see the wide disparity that has remained for the last decade under this government.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Madam Speaker, that is precisely why you are going to see tremendous growth in the community colleges across this

province. The Minister of Education and Training (Mr. McCrae) announced funding for colleges today, and I can tell him that the Assiniboine Community College in Brandon and the other community colleges are going to certainly take in more students in the next few years to train them. We anticipate there will be at least a thousand more students brought into that system to get training and find jobs that do exist here in Manitoba.

### **Aboriginal Communities Skills/Occupation Needs**

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Madam Speaker, the government's own documents on high-demand occupations in Manitoba indicate that in aboriginal communities, on and off reserve, in 1994 teacher aides, public health educators, social workers, addiction counsellors, et cetera, were all skills and occupations particularly required in aboriginal communities. In 1997, the same list occurs. In 1999, with one important exception, the same list occurs.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education why, in the 11 years of this government, on this government's watch they have been unable to meet any of the needs of these high-need communities.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Education and Training):** The honourable member should be aware of something Nuala Beck said when she was taking part in the millennium conference. She said that while 37.3 percent of the Canadian workforce is employed in high-knowledge jobs, the number for Manitoba is 39.3 percent. I am a little disappointed because Ms. Beck also pointed out that we are second in the world to the Netherlands. I would appreciate it if we could work our way to being No. 1. That is why the announcement today which pays attention to the job market out there and the needs that are there in the job market, and in a very effective way, responds to it.

**Ms. Friesen:** Would the minister, who should be aware of the very clear differences and experiences between aboriginal communities and the rest of Manitoba, should be aware that his government's cuts—and will he confirm that those cuts to the Access programs have made it

very, very difficult for aboriginal communities off reserve to meet the needs for training and for skills of those severely disadvantaged communities in Manitoba?

**Mr. McCrae:** The last thing I would do, Madam Speaker, would be to accept something coming as it does from the honourable member on this topic. Where was she when it came to offering praise to Anokiiwin school just the other day entering into a partnership with the Morris-MacDonald School Division to provide high school education for aboriginal people in Manitoba? Where is the praise that the honourable members opposite say will come when it is deserved? Well, it is certainly deserved and should be very much supported. I have not heard anything about that sort of private-public partnership that does so much for aboriginal people.

I have not heard any praise for the announcement today which provides for aboriginal opportunities in our community college sectors and the ongoing support through scholarships and bursaries for aboriginal and all Manitobans. I cannot understand the honourable member's question, and I certainly do not accept the preamble to it.

\* (1430)

**Ms. Friesen:** My final supplementary is to the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs. I would like to ask the minister to tell us why his government apparently believed in 1997 that medical directors and medical doctors were required in aboriginal communities and that in 1999 they do not seem to believe that. It is not on the list anymore. Is this an error or does the minister truly believe that medical doctors are not required in aboriginal communities?

**Hon. David Newman (Minister responsible for Native Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I have no knowledge of the allegation. I will take it under advisement and report back to the House.

### **Child Poverty Rate Reduction Strategy**

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Burrows, for one quick question.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** In the 1995 provincial election, the government promised to make health, education and social services child-centred, but since then cuts to health and education and children's services—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Martindale:** This government cuts \$23 million out of the welfare budget in 1996. The result is we have the highest rate of child poverty in Canada, the highest number of children in care and a thousand percent increase in children using food banks.

**Madam Speaker:** Question. Order, please.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I would appreciate the co-operation of all honourable members in allowing the honourable member for Burrows to quickly pose the last question of Question Period. Indeed, time has expired, but he had been recognized before the clock had expired.

**Mr. Martindale:** Why does this government, after 11 years in office, have no strategy for reducing the rate of poverty in Manitoba, given that the Social Planning Council, the National Council on Welfare and the United Nations last December all have condemned this province for their treatment of poverty and doing nothing? They have no strategy. When will they get a strategy? After 11 years, they have nothing.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Family Services):** I hear some of my colleagues indicate that I might be mad, but I am just extremely confused with the question that has been asked.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Well, Madam Speaker, I cannot understand how my honourable friend

could say that 11,000 people who have moved off our welfare system and into the workforce is not a positive thing for the province of Manitoba.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I am sure that everyone wants to have the minister complete her response. Could I please ask for the co-operation of all honourable members in allowing the honourable Minister of Family Services to complete her response.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There is a definite difference between our government and the opposition, who still like to promote welfare as the option and the opportunity for the people of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, we believe that people deserve the opportunity to work and to be productive in our community and our society. I make absolutely no excuses for working to try to ensure that people have jobs and have the ability to earn a higher income and move themselves out of poverty and into success and achievement. That is exactly the direction our government has taken with its economic policies that have allowed for the creation of jobs in Manitoba so Manitobans can work.

**Madam Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### Speaker's Rulings

**Madam Speaker:** I have two rulings for the House.

The honourable member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) on April 7 raised a matter of privilege respecting passage of the The Electoral Divisions Act.

Advice was given to the Chair by members, and I thank those members who provided advice.

Did the honourable member for The Maples raise the matter at the earliest opportunity? Yes, he did, and therefore the matter meets the first qualification for one of privilege. Did the honourable member provide prima facie evidence?

The member put forward the argument that there had been contempt of the Assembly because the legislation arising from the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission was being presented to the House shortly before an election.

Joseph Maingot on page 13 of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada—second edition*—gives this definition:

"If someone improperly interferes with the parliamentary work of a Member of Parliament—any of the Member's activities that have a connection with a proceeding in Parliament—in such a case that it is a matter involving parliamentary privilege. An offence against the authority of the House constitutes contempt."

On pages 13 and 14, he goes on to say:

"[P]rivilege is nevertheless subject to the practices and procedures of the House. Thus allegations of breach of privilege by a Member in the House of Commons that amount to complaints about procedures and practices in the House are by their very nature matters of order."

Therefore, in the matter raised by the honourable member, the parliamentary privileges of this House have not been breached; the motion put forward by the honourable member for The Maples cannot be accepted as a matter of privilege.

\* (1440)

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### National Organ Donation Discussion Day

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert):** Madam Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and that of all honourable members to an important event that takes place today. Today is the National Organ Donation Discussion Day. The idea is to raise the profile of organ donations and to bring families together to discuss their wishes on this topic. This way—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Could I please ask those members having private meetings to do so either in the loge or outside

the Chamber so that other members may be able to hear the honourable member for St. Norbert on his member's statement.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, today is National Organ Donation Discussion Day. The idea is to raise the profile of organ donations and to bring families together to discuss their wishes on this topic. This way, should a tragedy occur, the wishes of individuals are known, and the family members will not have to make hasty decisions. If an individual wishes to donate organs, other family members will take comfort in knowing that they have carried out their loved one's final wishes.

Madam Speaker, when a tragedy occurs, medical personnel and organ donor co-ordinators approach family members for the final consent. Whilst people may sign their organ donor cards, it is also important that family members are aware of their wishes. Time is of crucial importance in situations such as these. Organ donations require transportation and transplantation, and organs deteriorate after a 24-hour period. The odds of a successful transplant taking place increase dramatically when families make clear and quick decisions.

Madam Speaker, currently there are 2,800 Canadians waiting for lifesaving organ transplants. Although more than 21,000 Canadians have received organ transplants in the past few decades, hundreds of Canadians die every year while waiting for much-needed organs. We can help decrease these numbers by informing our family members of our wishes.

Madam Speaker, I urge all honourable members and all residents of the province to set aside time today to talk about organ donation with their loved ones to ensure that their wishes are understood and carried out. I would ask all my colleagues to consider becoming an organ donor. Thank you.

### Wasagamack Helicopter Accident

**Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupert's Land):** Madam Speaker, I have a statement.



Tomorrow, April 23, marks the first anniversary of the helicopter crash at Wasagamack. A year ago this tragedy took place in the community. The pilot, Jacques Nollette and two elders from the Wasagamack First Nation, Flora Harper and Bernadette Harper, were killed at that accident.

The crash occurred just months after the crash at Little Grand Rapids of course, and for more than five years the provincial government has been claiming that all other northern Manitoba airport improvements are on hold due to the commitment for the Wasagamack project. Last year, the very day before the crash, the band was sent a letter from INAC withdrawing support for the airport project.

Since then the federal government agreed to assist the project after all and there has been some progress, but it is expected that it will be at least two to three years before the project is completed. We recommended a task force on northern airports, identified some serious shortcomings at many of these northern airports. Madam Speaker, the only response has been a commitment to have the federal government fund lighted beacons at 17 of these 22 airports.

For some five weeks a year or longer, all goods and people going in and out of Garden Hill, Wasagamack and other communities, St. Theresa Point, must use a helicopter as the airport is on provincial land across the lake from the community. Other concerns, from: the runway is too short to accommodate the provincial air ambulance, to: the MTS tower on the edge of the God's River airstrip, have not been addressed.

So, Madam Speaker, I would like to extend, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, our sincere hope for strength for the families of the pilot, Mr. Nollette, and the two elders. Mrs. Flora Harper's son, William Little, who spoke out on the issue last year, to Flora's husband, Epstein Harper, who survived the crash—we wish him continued good health—and Sam Harper who also survived the crash. We are indeed grateful that the Creator spared their lives so that they will be here to talk about this in a time to come and that the need for

improvements in northern air transportation will perhaps be heard at some point by a caring government. Thank you.

### **Winnipeg Police Service Anniversary**

**Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples):** Madam Speaker, I rise to make a statement in regard to an event that is happening this year. I do not know how many chances I will get to make a member's statement, so I want to draw members' attention to the fact that this year is the 125th anniversary of the Winnipeg Police Service. I want to draw members' attention that it will also be the 75th anniversary of the Winnipeg Police charity ball coming up in May. Last year there was myself, the member nominated in Carman—I do not know what his present riding is—and I believe the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) were at the police charity ball last year. I hope as many members as possible will join in with the Winnipeg Police Service to join in this 75th anniversary of their charity ball and also to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Winnipeg Police Service.

In regard to the anniversary of the Police Service, many members may not know that at 130 Allard Avenue there is a police museum. The curator, Staff Sergeant Jack Templeman, retired, would be pleased to show members around there. I would encourage members to tour the police museum and also possibly take constituents and children who would be interested in seeing the history of the police service, a very proud history that I am proud to be a part of, Madam Speaker. So thank you for this opportunity.

### **Order of Sports Excellence Awards**

**Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina):** Earlier this week I had the pleasure of representing Premier Filmon and the Honourable Eric Stefanson, Minister responsible for Sport, for the presentation of the Province of Manitoba's Order of Sports Excellence Awards at the Garden Valley Collegiate in Winkler. I was delighted to extend very warm congratulations to the Garden Valley Collegiate Boys Basketball Team for winning the Provincial AAA Basketball Championship and to the Garden Valley Collegiate Boys Soccer

Team for winning the 1999 rural Manitoba High School Soccer Championship.

The Order of Sports Excellence consists of certificates and medallions for athletes and coaches who have excelled in their sport. Through the collective effort and hard work of the players and coaches, the teams were able to achieve great success.

I would also like to take a moment to recognize all the students and staff who supported the teams throughout the year. A winning team consists of dedicated and skilled players, but it also includes a group of committed and supportive school mates, teachers, administrators and family. I would like to congratulate the support group of these teams for their efforts. It is evident that the entire school has worked together to make the two teams a winning success. I am certain that their enthusiasm and support has been very much appreciated by the players and coaches alike. Please join me in congratulating the Garden Valley boys basketball and soccer teams on achieving the province of Manitoba's Order of Sports Excellence and encouraging all Manitobans to participate in sports in this province. Thank you very much.

\* (1450)

#### **National Child Care Conference**

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne):** Madam Speaker, this morning, along with my colleagues from St. James and Burrows, I attended the opening ceremonies and keynote address of the 1999 national Child Care Conference co-hosted by the Manitoba child care association and the Canadian Child Care Association. The theme this year, the Spirit of the Village, reflects the belief that schools, child care centres, churches, government, community and family are all necessary partners in creating full and healthy lives for our children. The keynote speaker, Dr. Gordon Cleveland, spoke on the benefits and costs of good child care, interestingly entitled—subtitled, pardon me, The Economic Rationale for Public Investment in Young Children. Dr. Cleveland identifies several factors as straws in a wind that signify a changing attitude toward child care. He identifies shifting fiscal

conditions, changing families and family needs and child poverty.

He sees these as indications that Canadians and their governments may, once again, be concerned about child care. He believes the time is right for advancement but warns that we must move wisely and cautiously, Madam Speaker.

Dr. Cleveland made reference to many major studies which demonstrate the social and personal value of early childhood education. Most of them are familiar to us. His particular study was a cost-benefit analysis, and his basic conclusion is that the benefits exceed the costs by two to one. Furthermore, children, parents, family, society, and governments benefit as a result of a universal high-quality early childhood education. But the accents here are on universal and high quality, and the centrality of these factors suggest, as Dr. Cleveland made clear, that child care must not be left to the whims of the market.

In closing, I just want to add that experts are beginning to recognize early childhood education as perhaps the most important tier in our education, and given this awareness, Madam Speaker, I urge the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) to do something posthaste to address the near critical shortage of child care workers in our system.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

##### **House Business**

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, in discussions with the opposition House leader (Mr. Ashton), what we will be doing this afternoon is calling for report stage on Bill 2. That then will be followed by resumption of debate on second reading of Bill 17.

##### **REPORT STAGE**

##### **Bill 2—The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act**

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of

Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Tweed) (by leave), that Bill 2, The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les circonscriptions électorales, reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### House Business

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, should debate on Bill 17 be completed before private members' hour, then I would ask that you call for second reading, Bills 4, 5, 6, and 11.

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

#### Bill 17—The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading on Bill 17, The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi électorale et la Loi sur le financement des campagnes électorales).

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act. As we all know, the reasons for these amendments have to do with Judge Monnin's inquiry and his recommendations. I suspect that had there been no vote-rigging scandal in the 1995 election and no Monnin inquiry, we would not be debating any of these amendments during this session.

However, it is normal after an election for the Chief Electoral Officer to write a report and to make recommendations about amendments to legislation and in fact we did pass some amendments to the legislation after the '95 election. However, apparently we did not go nearly far enough. We did not even know that we needed to go further, but, as the result of Judge Monnin's inquiry, we have had to make substantial and considerable changes.

I would like to look at Judge Monnin's recommendations and then ask the question as to why he recommended these particular items and then answer that. The first recommendation was that the statute of limitations on prosecutions be extended to within one year from the date upon

which the Chief Electoral Officer, quote: "has reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed."

Now why would Judge Monnin have made that recommendation? Well, it relates to the finding that Messrs. Sokolyk, Aitken, and Barrett broke Section 145(1) of The Elections Act by inducing Darryl Sutherland to run. Now, the judge used rather polite language when he used the word "inducing." Some people have suggested that it was really a bribe to run, which I suppose is a more technical way of saying that he was offered money in return for running. We know that he was offered a considerable amount of money, considering that he was on social assistance. When you know that all of a sudden someone has a large sum of money, probably more than what his annual income was on social assistance, in order to be a candidate for five weeks, it certainly raised suspicions. But it did not take very long for people to find out in the Interlake what was going on because people were talking about what was really happening in the allegedly independent candidate's campaign and who was supporting him and who was financing him.

It also relates to the findings that Sutherland, Wilson and McFarlane breached The Elections Finances Act. None of these two individuals could be prosecuted because of the statute of limitations of two years from the offence.

Now it is really quite unfortunate that it took so long for the offences to surface, for those offences to be investigated, and for an inquiry to be struck, not because there were not attempts made to have an investigation. In fact, there was a preliminary investigation, but it did not go very far. One of the reasons, of course, for that is that people were not very co-operative. I understand, and I am going from memory here, that some people did not answer questions, but I believe it is also true that The Elections Act and The Elections Finances Act at the time did not have enough power in order to force people to testify, and they could not compel the producing of documents. They did not have the power to subpoena witnesses and subpoena documents.

I believe we have taken care of that. Had people been more forthcoming and had people

told the truth, probably the original investigation would have gone a lot farther in 1995, and we would have had these amendments behind us in 1995. In fact, I think if the government has any regrets, they probably wish that the truth had come out in 1995, right after they won an election, rather than in 1998 and 1999, just before a general election. The timing of these revelations is rather a nightmare for the government, I suspect, especially when you have a public inquiry that makes the news every night, and bad news for this government and for their party and for many individuals.

The second recommendation was that the Legislature move rapidly when the Chief Electoral Officer requests an amendment to the relevant statutes. This refers to past delays in bringing forward amendments to election statutes. It really should not be necessary for someone such as the Chief Electoral Officer, who is independent of the government, who reports to the Legislative Assembly rather than to a minister, to have his or her recommendations not acted upon. I think that would be true whether it was the Chief Electoral Officer or the Ombudsman or now the Children's Advocate. Because of their independence and impartiality, I think we have to take their recommendations very seriously. Their recommendations are public ones, produced in their annual reports, and it really is important that we as legislators act expeditiously on their recommendations.

Number three, Judge Monnin recommended that all parties prepare a code of ethics. Now I wonder why Judge Monnin had to do that. Well, I suggest it relates to the culture of the Tory party around the election scheme.

\* (1500)

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Mr. Martindale:** We have many examples. If the member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer) would like some proof, I would be happy to supply some proof.

We have some quotes here from Judge Monnin's report, and I would like to read some of those quotes into the record because they are

very succinct. I do not have a letter. I just have quotes from a report. For example, when Mr. Sokolyk was on the stand, it became fairly obvious, in his mind, that the end justifies the means. For example, he described the time outside of election as peacetime. One can only conclude from that, that according to his definitions an election period is a time of war, and we know that wartime justifies almost anything in the minds of most people. We have seen lots of evidence that people in the Conservative Party felt that winning at any cost was acceptable.

Then there is Mr. Benson who said, and I quote: "My only transgression in the whole affair was exercising poor judgment." He also said that not telling the Premier was another "bad decision." This was recorded in the Winnipeg Free Press on February 5, 1999. So we have some people here who have problems with ethics, because in their mind it was only poor judgment, it was not a matter of right and wrong. Had they thought of things in terms of right and wrong, perhaps they would not have committed these offences in the first place.

Then there is Mr. Kozminski, a well-known fundraiser and donor for the Conservative Party, who said, "Quite frankly, with my political leanings and what the NDP has done to this province over the years, I would do anything to take votes away from the NDP." This was in the Winnipeg Sun on February 10, 1999.

So here is an individual who was unusually candid and actually spoke his mind. We certainly do not agree with the contents, but Mr. Kozminski said something really quite offensive saying he would do anything to take votes away from the NDP. I think when people are into that kind of political culture, they certainly are willing to do anything to get elected, including inducing people to run, giving them money to run, deliberately trying to split the vote. There is really no end to what they might do if they believe that winning at any cost is acceptable.

It is quite disappointing that there is a lack of respect for other political parties, a lack of acknowledgement that the will of the people

should prevail, and that when people are defeated that you accept that, and from time to time governments are defeated because people change their voting patterns. I think it is normal to have a certain amount of respect for your opponents. I know that many people on election night when they lose an election, they go to their opponent's headquarters and congratulate the winner in person. I think that is the decent thing to do. But if you consider that the other party are your enemies and that winning at any cost is acceptable, then why would you congratulate your opponent. You would not act in a civil manner if you believe that winning at any cost is acceptable or that elections are war.

There are some members here who have never lost an election, so they do not know what it is like to go and congratulate their opponent for winning. [interjection] Oh, you are waiting for the congratulations, too. I get your point. Well, I would have to say it is not universally practised.

**An Honourable Member:** Should be.

**Mr. Martindale:** But as the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) says, it should be.

Then there is another well-known Conservative, Mr. Thorsteinson, who said, and I quote: My personal contributions to their campaigns were entirely appropriate and legal under The Elections Finances Act and were a private matter. The gist of it was it certainly cannot hurt the Tory candidate. It was no secret that a lot of the First Nations vote was in favour of the New Democratic Party.

Well, it is pretty sad when someone of that stature in the business community—well, formerly anyway—and in the Conservative Party—at least formerly—thinks that what they were doing was appropriate and legal, because I think most Manitobans feel that it was inappropriate for one party to fund a second party in order to disenfranchise or split the votes or cause the defeat of a third party. It is very sad that the people who were being used in this scheme are amongst the most vulnerable people in Manitoba, and they chose people rather deliberately that could be conned into running and thereby hoped that they might split the vote

and cause a different outcome in those three ridings. You know, people have said to me, well, it is really no big deal because it did not change the outcome of the election in any of those ridings. Well, had they been even marginally more successful in one of those campaigns, in the campaign in Swan River, the outcome would have been different because our MLA for Swan River only won by 36 votes in 1995. So had another party, an independent candidate, for example, got 18 more votes or 19 more votes, our candidate in Swan River would have been defeated.

I think it would have been really embarrassing to have been the Conservative candidate and the Conservative MLA for Swan River and to have to sit in this Legislature for four years and then find out that they won a fixed election. I think they probably would have resigned. They would have been so embarrassed if they had to sit here after the Monnin report came out because they had won a fixed election. It is probably a good thing that it did not succeed for the sake of their candidate if for nothing else. They certainly tried, but it is a good thing in many different ways that they were unsuccessful.

Then there is Mr. Barrett who really could not see the error of his ways and said, and I quote: I didn't do nothing wrong. Winnipeg Free Press, January 23, 1999.

I think he meant he did not do anything wrong. I wonder if he gets it. I wonder if he sees now that the inquiry is over and the judge's report is out and the damage that it caused to his political party that he still feels vindicated. I do not know how he could possibly feel that way.

Then there is Mr. McNichol. I believe he was the lawyer for the Conservative Party at the Monnin inquiry. He said, and I quote: this inquiry is not about judging or commenting on matters of morality, ethics, political gamesmanship and political strategies. The plan was not illegal, it was just stupid.

Well, I beg to differ and Judge Monnin begs to differ. If it was not for comments like that, Judge Monnin would not have recommended that all parties prepare a code of ethics.

Obviously, you know, the lawyer was trying to minimize this affair, which, of course, is what Conservative supporters do when they say—and I have heard people say this and some of it was reported in the Winnipeg Free Press—things like this: it was no big deal; this happens in politics all the time; or, why would you spend a million and a half dollars to investigate \$5,000 of illegal spending, it is a waste of money.

\*(1510)

Well, I think it does matter, because if you corrupt part of the democratic process, and not just any part of the democratic process but one of the fundamentals of democracy, namely, having a fair election, then nothing else matters. If you corrupt election day, then the government is really governing for the next four years or five years without a legitimate mandate. As I suggested in my Throne Speech Debate, it is very ironic that Canada sends observers to other countries around the world to supervise elections to make sure that they are fair, and yet in Manitoba we have an attempt by the Conservative Party to corrupt an election in 1995.

I think it is quite appropriate that Judge Monnin recommended that all parties prepare a code of ethics. This is really a matter of protecting all parties, not just the Conservative Party, from problems in the future. So all parties either have an existing code of ethics or they are going to draft a code of ethics, and this will protect people from getting into problems in the future. I think this is a good thing because people need to know in advance of elections what should be done and what should not be done, what is ethical and what is unethical. You know, being a signator on documents for Elections Manitoba is a big responsibility. We who are elected really have to trust people who give us advice, because especially during an election, I guess less so after an election when maybe there is time to scrutinize all the documents, we as candidates are very busy knocking on doors and so we rely on our campaign manager. We rely on people who file documents on our behalf at Elections Manitoba to do the right thing and to make sure that those documents are in keeping with all of the requirements. I think all of us appreciate those

people who work in our campaigns and have to meet all of those reporting requirements because those requirements are really quite stringent. There are lots of documents that have to be filed, and they have to be done right. So any guidance that we can get in terms of a code of ethics is unfortunately needed because of what the Conservative party did in 1995, but they are there for the protection of all of us in the future.

Here is another one of Judge Monnin's findings on ethics. I quote from his report on page 11: "Political mores have reached a dangerous low when one party member can actively support his party but sees nothing objectionable in helping to finance and organize the candidate of a second party in order to harm a third party." This is really a direct reflection on people who gave testimony who said that they did not see any problem with that. Obviously Judge Monnin did, and he commented on it in his report. That is one of the reasons why he believed and believes that all parties must have a code of ethics.

He also said on page 13, and I quote: "The attempt here at vote splitting . . . was in my opinion clearly unethical and morally reprehensible." Now some people have said "vote fracturing." I believe that was the expression that some of the witnesses used. It kind of sounds like a technical term that people might not understand, and therefore they might not get the implication or they might think that it was not vote splitting for some reason because vote splitting is a very clear idea. But Judge Monnin said that it was clearly unethical and morally reprehensible.

He also said on page 55: "I cannot ignore the fact that throughout this episode, especially during the investigation and at the hearings, some of these witnesses exhibited a degree of arrogance or an 'I know better' attitude." Now, I think that is a very significant comment from Judge Monnin because at the beginning it appeared that one of the witnesses was being given a rough time on the witness stand and did not appear to be a credible witness in the eyes of some people. But by the end, by the time that parade of Tories had gone through the witness stand, I think a very different impression was created, that in fact Darryl Sutherland was the

credible witness and what he said stood up under cross-examination, but some of the other people were incredible witnesses or not credible witnesses because they were not forthcoming with the truth.

There is a considerable amount of documentation to show that when they were interviewed they were not forthcoming with the truth, that when they signed affidavits they were not telling the truth, and it was only when they took the stand and they could no longer deny the veracity of what was happening and what they did and what they had said that they were forced to ultimately tell the truth when they were subpoenaed and when they were under oath.

Judge Monnin also recommended that Elections Manitoba revise its reporting format and devise a method whereby all political parties and candidates properly record their sources of income and expenditure. Now why would Judge Monnin make this recommendation? Well, it relates to the findings by Monnin that Benson, Sokolyk and McFarlane participated in a cover-up of financial records.

We thought we had a little bit of information about what happened in the 1995 election in three ridings prior to April 1995. We had no idea the extent of what was going on in those three election campaigns, and we had very little information about the extent of the cover-up. Why would that be? Well, it could be because we asked questions of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and others, and they said they did not know anything, but many of the key players knew lots but they were not telling. They were not telling the Premier, and apparently the Premier was not asking. For example, Taras Sokolyk did not come forward with evidence to the Elections Manitoba investigation despite being asked to do so by the Premier and Barb McFarlane, the party's chief financial officer and legal counsel. He instead enlisted the help of Jules Benson to cover up the transactions.

Now, these are some of the people who are in big trouble now with the professional associations to which they belong, particularly Messrs. Benson and McFarlane who are going to be investigated by whatever committee it is that investigates professional misconduct. They

could very well lose their authority to call themselves chartered accountants, or some people may be facing worse consequences after the Monnin report is reviewed by a Crown Attorney from British Columbia.

Mr. Jules Benson agreed to help Taras Sokolyk cover up the transaction by first depositing money orders to the PC account and then pulling out supporting documents and urging the campaign comptroller to keep them separate from the rest of the documentation being used for the Elections Manitoba return.

Well, you know, it would be very interesting to have been in the minds of these people while these things were going on and to know at what point did they realize that they were doing something stupid, or at what point did they realize they were doing something unethical; at what point did they realize they were doing something immoral; at what point did they realize they were doing something that was illegal? Then all of a sudden the wheels started to turn and they thought, oh, oh, I might get caught here; I guess I had better cover my tracks. [interjection] Some of them did not realize it until they were on the witness stand when Judge Monnin was asking them questions, but, obviously, some of them had some thoughts about what they were doing during the election campaign because they started to cover their tracks, I guess hoping that they would not be traced.

I think one of their major problems was that they thought it was okay unless they got caught. However, it must have occurred to them that something was wrong, and they had to do something to make sure that they covered their tracks, so they started moving money around in various ways to hide what they were doing.

Mr. Gordon McFarlane knowingly withheld supporting documentation from Elections Manitoba initially and later in 1995 and 1996, when there were additional requests for more complete information for the audit process. So at least by the time Elections Manitoba was asking questions in 1995, Mr. McFarlane realized that he had a very serious problem and that if he actually came forward and told the truth and provided documents that he was going

to be in big trouble. So he withheld supporting documents.

Mr. Monnin recommended that audit methods be improved and we can see why, because of the way that certain financial transactions were going on. Judge Monnin recommended periodic investigations and audits of the financial affairs and accounts of any registered political party and that these should be undertaken by Elections Manitoba. Judge Monnin recommended that candidates be compelled to keep all records and documents for a period of at least five years from the date of filing a statement or return.

Now, why would Judge Monnin recommend something like that? Well, it relates to the fact that a third of the financial records of the PC Party were lost up until near the end of the inquiry. It also relates to the fact that lost or destroyed documents was an excuse used by Sokolyk and McFarlane to cover up the transactions.

\* (1520)

That was a very interesting part of the public inquiry, when documents were requested and all of a sudden we heard that they had been lost. I guess maybe they thought that if they were lost, that was better for them. However, they must have had second thoughts about this, too, and decided, well, maybe they should find them, and so a search was undertaken, and, no, they were not lost after all.

But I wonder, were they misplaced or were they misfiled or did someone not know where they were? They must have had a lot of internal inquiries or they must have been scrambling internally to find all these lost documents. Maybe they just got lucky and the documents appeared. So the result is that Judge Monnin had to make a recommendation about that, too. So we hope that in future this will never happen because all of us will have to keep records for five years.

I would like to read into the record some of the comments that the judge made. However, there is one comment that I cannot read into the record because I rose on a point of order recently

on it, and the Speaker took it under advisement, and we will have a written ruling by the Speaker on one of the comments in the Monnin inquiry. It does seem kind of sad that something that is said outside of the Legislature cannot be repeated, and I actually thought that the government member who spoke on my point of order was supporting what I was saying.

However, Judge Monnin did say, and I quote: "It is disheartening indeed to realize that an oath to tell the truth means so little to some people." He said: "A vote-rigging plot constitutes an unconscionable debasement of the citizen's right to vote. To reduce the voting rights of individuals is a violation of our democratic system." He also said: the basic "premise was that aboriginal people in these ridings had historically voted for the NDP, but 'the aboriginal vote' would be split if there were aboriginal candidates running. The attempt here at vote splitting . . . was in my opinion clearly unethical and morally reprehensible."

It is too bad that the Conservative Party does not get it. If they really want to split the NDP vote and garner aboriginal votes, they should get aboriginal people recruited as candidates from their party to run in winnable ridings. Now we know that they do recruit aboriginal people, but then they get them to run in hopeless ridings where they do not have a chance of getting elected, but if they had any serious intent to split the NDP vote and take it away, they would run aboriginal people in winnable seats for their party. I do not think we will see that for a long time.

Judge Monnin also said: "Political mores have reached a dangerous low when one party member can actively support his party, but sees nothing objectionable in helping to finance and organize the candidate of a second party in order to harm a third party." Now, I hope that theory has been put to rest forever, that no one will try anything that stupid again.

Judge Monnin said: "I cannot ignore the fact that throughout this episode, especially during the investigation and at the hearings, some of these witnesses exhibited a degree of arrogance or an 'I know better' attitude." I think I have already read that into the record, but it



certainly does not hurt to repeat some of these quotes.

Judge Monnin also said: "A considerable amount of time, effort and money was expended by this Commission in order to confirm what should have been freely admitted at the outset." The bank records and other documentation of the PC Party of Manitoba election account and of other individuals had to be obtained and examined to find out what really happened. So I think this is a good rebuttal to the people who say that this was a waste of money, that you should not spend a million and a half dollars to investigate \$5,000. Judge Monnin is saying that it was not necessary in the first place if people had told the truth and produced the documents during the original investigation. Then there would not have been a public inquiry with a judge and all that expense.

There are a lot of Tories that really do not get it. I was at a banquet recently, and one of the backbenchers was regaling us with a story about people in his constituency saying, you know, \$4,000 is no big deal, that is more than we spend on you in coffee in a year. Ha, ha, ha. I said: do not laugh. This is costing you votes. Oh, I forgot the second half of his quote which is also quite telling. His constituents said: if you wanted serious money, you should have asked us for \$40,000, and this is after the Monnin inquiry.

It is almost unbelievable that some Conservative Party supporters, even after what happened publicly in terms of the alleged vote-rigging scheme in 1995, and after the questions in the Legislature in 1998, and the Monnin inquiry in 1998 to 1999, and Judge Monnin's report, and all the publicity and all the bad publicity for their party, still did not get it and thought that it is acceptable to make jokes about raising money for the Conservative Party to use in illegal ways. I do not know how long it is going to take for them to get it, but they should be telling their supporters that this attitude is wrong rather than repeating it and trying to entertain other people with these kinds of ridiculous comments.

Madam Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying that I hope that everyone here has learned a lesson because these things have an effect on

all of us, not just on the Conservative Party, not just on government members on the other side, but they have an effect on all of us as elected people. It contributes to the cynicism of the public about elected people in our society. It does not matter whether it is Conservative Party members going to jail in Saskatchewan or whether it is all the people that were forced to resign from the Mulroney cabinet in the federal government under Prime Minister Mulroney, but it contributes to the cynicism of the public regarding all of us as elected people, regardless of party.

I get that when I go door to door in my constituency between elections and during election campaigns. I get people who say to me it does not matter, there is no difference between the parties. We hear that, we hear that from Conservative Party members during their speeches and when they are heckling us, in spite of the fact that there are no comparable scandals on this side of the House. The two major scandals in the history of Manitoba, the building of this Legislature and the vote-splitting scandal, happened when the Conservative Party was in office, but, unfortunately, people generalize, and it hurts all of us as MLAs or as members of Parliament. I suspect it probably affects municipal officials.

That makes it harder to elect, not just to elect people, that makes it harder to recruit people to run for elected office. There are people in our society who have a considerable amount of prestige and job security who are very intelligent people who we want to have running for our party, and I am sure the Conservative Party wants those kinds of people, even the Liberal Party wants those kinds of people running. All parties want people who have public credibility, who are intelligent, who have good ideas, who are committed running for their party.

But when you go to meet with these people to try and recruit them, whether it is over lunch in a restaurant or at their home or at a party meeting, some of them are very reluctant to run. I think it is a good thing that we get as many people who are credible candidates to run as we do. But certainly things like the Conservative

Party vote-rigging scandal make it harder for us to recruit credible candidates to run for our party. I suspect that if I were to talk to members of the Conservative Party informally and off the record, they would admit that as well. They would admit that it hurts them too.

So we hope that this never happens again, that we never again in the history of Manitoba have a scandal of this magnitude, that people do not cover up, that people do not lie, that people do not obstruct justice, that people do not perjure themselves and that they do not commit these kinds of offences in the first place so that there does not need to be an inquiry by Elections Manitoba or a judicial inquiry. [interjection] And as the member for Thompson says, if we get rid of the Tories, that would help.

Well, we know that political parties pay a price for this. We know that people got pretty fed up with the shenanigans of the federal Conservative Party and the result was that they were almost wiped out. This is going to have an effect on the Conservative Party in Manitoba, because people are still talking about it, and they will pay a price for it.

\* (1530)

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to add my comments on Bill 17, The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act. This piece of legislation was of course made necessary as a result of actions by the members opposite, members of the Conservative Party and of course all of the people that were involved and implicated as a part of the Monnin inquiry report.

Now, this legislation has included a number of the recommendations by Judge Monnin and of course will hopefully go a long way towards resolving some of the problems that were since and subsequently found to be necessary as a result of limitations that were in place restricting or limiting the ability of Elections Manitoba to conduct elections in a fair and impartial manner and also to allow them the opportunity to take whatever legal steps were necessary to ensure that elections were run in that particular manner.

In this piece of legislation there will be changes, including the limitation for the period of prosecutions, which had been a problem. As a result of the Monnin inquiry, Judge Monnin indicated that there would be some difficulty in prosecuting individuals who were found to have broken the existing laws and created a problem in that there was a statute of limitation of, I think, two years, that would have since expired that would prevent any prosecution of individuals who broke the act.

That is unfortunate that there had not been some flexibility for them, but I understand that there is a special prosecutor who may be investigating these matters with respect to other charges that may be forthcoming which may also include perjury charges for members of the Conservative Party who were involved in perjuring themselves before the Monnin inquiry and during the course of the investigation by Elections Manitoba and its officers. We will wait to see with great anticipation how that works its way through the process, and we trust that there will be an open process there to allow the public the opportunity to view very clearly the state of the investigations with regard to these special prosecutors' activities.

Under the Bill 17 changes that are occurring, of course, there will be a requirement now of maintaining of records that will require that the records from any particular election campaign for any candidate for the parties involved, anyone associated with the elections for those parties, or as independent candidates, that those records be maintained for a period of at least five years now, under this legislation, from the date the statement or return is filed, which will go a long way, I think, towards giving the investigating arms of Elections Manitoba or the courts if necessary to look at records to help them along with any examination for discovery if that should be warranted or necessary in the future.

This bill also goes towards inspections and audits and allows for greater processes to occur there. It will allow the Chief Electoral Officer or designate to enter onto a premise to inspect records and if necessary to obtain a search warrant to allow that process to occur, and also to make sure that there are no wild fishing

expeditions that are undertaken, but that there would be serious concerns that would be investigated by Elections Manitoba.

There was also, because there was a limitation on the period for prosecutions and that is going to be changed now so that the Chief Electoral Officer will have new powers so that the Chief Electoral Officer, when he or she discovers that there is reasonable or probable grounds to believe that an offence has been committed, that the period of limitation would commence from that point and it would now be one year from that particular time. I hope and I trust that when the Chief Electoral Officer in the future, should this ever occur again, of course that this information would be public and that the Chief Electoral Officer would in the best tradition perform their duties within that particular new time frame that is being allowed for under this legislation.

Now, Madam Speaker, this bill, I think it makes some very reasonable and responsible amendments to The Elections Finance Act and The Elections Act itself. I think these are reasonable amendments and would be supportive of these changes. My one wish that when some of the hearings were taking place that some of the people that were part of the Monnin inquiry investigation in the ongoing examination and cross-examination that was occurring at that hearing that the members of the Conservative Party that were commenting had not been so hesitant and in fact had been so recalcitrant in their position in not wanting to comment openly and freely about their involvement in this election-rigging scheme.

One of the problems that I see that has occurred as a result of the Monnin inquiry and I have to go back to my early times coming to this particular Legislature that in 1990, and in fact in the year before that process even started to run in the election of 1990, I had decided after consultation with my family that I would become involved in the electoral process and would seek the nomination of my party for the community of Transcona. Of course, my family was hesitant for me to become involved in that process knowing that there would be a considerable commitment of time and effort, and, of course, that has come to be true. It has

taken a great deal of my time away from my family, and they have made the sacrifice probably more than I have.

In this occupation, I find—I thought coming to this place that it would be an honourable employment and a dignified employment in coming to this place and that I would be able to represent the wishes of the majority of my constituents, hopefully, and that they in return would provide me with advice and guidance along the way and constructive criticism if it was necessary and warranted, as sometimes it is. Sometimes we all need to hear that there are some things we have not done quite right or said quite right, and we hope that we have skins that are thick enough to listen to those concerns.

I do know that in talking with my constituents as this Monnin inquiry process has wound its way along, my constituents are telling me that they are quite distressed by what has happened. In many cases, they view the life of someone who comes to this place, into elected office, to be still an honourable employment or position in our society, and they would hope that the people whom they send to this particular Legislature would conduct themselves in the proper and appropriate manner. They view that the activities of the Conservative Party and members of the government who were involved in this process have failed the people of my community and that they have destroyed the trust that we had and continue to try to work so hard to build between ourselves and our communities.

Being in the occupation of politician is not always one that is viewed in high esteem. Quite often, we make jokes about ourselves, and people make jokes about this occupation, as being not quite sure where it fits in the pecking order between lawyers, used car salesmen and dentists and whether or not a politician would be relegated to a position considerably lower than that particular pecking order. That is the way my constituents have related and those are their comments that I put on the record here, not to denigrate in any way any of the people occupying or doing those particular employments, but that is what my constituents have said to me, no offence intended for the member opposite who came from that former life before

he came here and before he became a minister of this Legislature. But those are the comments that have been said to me by some of my constituents.

It is unfortunate that we have through this process had an undermining of our political and democratic processes and institutions in our province at a time when we are trying very hard to build up public confidence in our public system and in those who occupy the jobs of elected representatives for our communities. Then we have the Monnin inquiry that tears everything down that we have worked so hard to try and build. One of the unfortunate parts of the inquiry—and I have read through the inquiry. I have read most, if not all, of the media reports with respect to the Monnin inquiry. I have listened and read some of the transcripts of individuals who have been involved in the Monnin inquiry investigation, and I am quite distressed by some of the comments that I find are occurring.

One of the things that I find most distressing is the fact that when we come to run as candidates within a particular political party to represent or try and represent the communities in which we are seeking election, that we do so in a manner that, yes, we would fight the election campaign on the issues that are important to our communities and we would put forward our positions, our platforms, our principles or our values that we hold near and dear to ourselves and in our lives and that the public then would determine who would be the best representative for their community based on those values.

\* (1540)

What I am distressed by is that the comments that I heard coming from the Monnin inquiry and that I continue to see here in responses to some of the questions that were raised here just this week with respect to the way the government has handled its affairs, that there does not seem to have been a lesson learned through the Monnin inquiry process.

The people in the inquiry—and I can only think back to one Robert Kozminski who is a well-known member to the Conservative Party, who is a member of the PC Manitoba Fund, I

believe, and one of the chief fundraisers for the Conservative Party for a considerable number of years; in fact, it has even gone back into decades. Now I know Mr. Kozminski and his particular car dealer business here in the city of Winnipeg, in fact right in my own community of Transcona—

**An Honourable Member:** Big Bob.

**Mr. Reid:** Big Bob, as my colleague references, when he was on the witness stand during the Monnin inquiry referenced: I will do anything that it takes to defeat the NDP.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** That is one time he was honest, the only time.

**Mr. Reid:** Perhaps he was honest, and we have to take him at face value. The retired Justice Monnin did not say that statement was not untruthful; in fact, I think he believed it was truthful because he even referenced that comment in his recommendations. What I find distressing is that Mr. Kozminski has his business in the community of Transcona taking money from the very people whom he is working against. So he is making his profit on the backs of the working people, those NDPers that have elected their representatives to come to this Legislature, members for Transcona, Radisson (Ms. Cerilli), Concordia (Mr. Doer), Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), and Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak)—

**Mr. Ashton:** Maybe we should let the people in Transcona know.

**Mr. Reid:** I can assure my colleague for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) that is one of the concerns that has been raised by constituents of mine who have called me and made comment to me about Mr. Kozminski's actions in this election-rigging scandal and this election bribery scandal that we have here as a result of the Conservative Party involvement.

You would think that Mr. Kozminski would have some common sense to think that you do not dump in your own nest. Here is where I am getting my money from. These are the people who are buying my vehicles, and yet I am going to take their money that they have given me

from the profit on those sales. I am going to give it to the Conservative Party to undermine the democratic electoral process that my people in my community think is there and is fair for them and that they will have an equal opportunity to cast their votes, as any other member of that constituency or any other elector or voter in the province of Manitoba.

Yet there does not seem to be a grain or even a sense that I get of understanding or caring of what it is that the Conservative members and party have done to undermine the electoral process in this province. You and your supporters have taken steps to say to the people of Manitoba that the electoral process does not matter. You as Conservatives, in other words, will do whatever it takes to win an election campaign.

Now I have absolutely no fault with you going into an election campaign the same way as we would and fighting election campaigns fairly based on the issues that are involved in the campaign and the issues that are important to our community. I have to look at the Conservative co-chair sitting in the front rows here, the former Deputy Premier, and the one in the back, the other co-chair of the election campaign for the Conservative Party—

**An Honourable Member:** How did that election turn out, anyway?

**Mr. Reid:** Well, if you want to go back to that election, I guess, if it was not for your untruthfulness dealing with the Jets issue and your election bribing activities, you would not be in those benches. You would be in these benches over here. So we went to the public in Manitoba and we told the truth.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**An Honourable Member:** I cannot hear, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Reid:** I find it interesting, Madam Speaker, that as we are going through this Bill 17 now, we have been on this—and I am not sure if this is our second or third day of debate—but the member

who is now retiring, the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey), has not spoken on this piece of legislation, and he is supposed to be the lead person. The person involved with the ethics of the Conservative Party has not even put on the record what the ethics change of your party is going to be with respect to the upcoming provincial general election.

Now, perhaps it is not important to you and perhaps someday we will see the member for Arthur-Virden on the witness stand. I mean, we saw what happened in Saskatchewan with Grant Devine's government. Of course, Mr. Devine has yet to be called to the stand to give any testimony, and, yes, he had the same set of blinkers on. He did not know anything that was going on in his government. But I can tell you that perhaps that new wooden jail that you are building over in Fort Garry would be a reasonable way for you to house your people in the future, the PC pen. Considering what Saskatchewan has had to do when they have, I believe, had to build new jails for members of the Conservative Party in that province.

**An Honourable Member:** They might win the prison vote.

**Mr. Reid:** Perhaps, and I know some of my colleagues have referenced how important the prison vote is and that perhaps you will have a chance to influence the prison vote in the future. We will see as time goes on how that progresses.

I look only to the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), who is—it is funny too that she announced her retirement after the Premier made the cabinet shuffle so that she could stay in cabinet. I am just wondering if there was a little discussion between herself and the Premier that perhaps the member for Fort Garry knows a little bit more about the Premier's involvement in this bribery, election-rigging scandal than what is being let on here. I am not worried about what the member for Arthur-Virden thinks with respect to what the future holds for me or what it does not hold for me. What is important here is that I come to this place having fought the issues of the election campaign openly and fairly and let the electorate of my community of Transcona decide who is best to represent that community, not rigging the election campaign to get to this

place. If I ever have to be put in a position of making that decision, I will tell you, I will leave this business. I will never run for an election campaign where I do not have to be open and fair with the constituents who are there to elect their representative here. I do not need to cheat to come to this place; I will go someplace else and find other employment if somebody asks me to take those steps. I am not going to be involved or stoop to your level.

Yes, I put it on the record, and I thought long and hard about what I was going to say for this particular piece of legislation. I think it is important that we do represent the viewpoints, the principles, and the values that we hold very near and dear to our hearts and that we tell the electorate what is important during an election campaign, what is important to us, and then let them make the decision.

I do not think there is a need to have to take those \$5,000 to try and give it to somebody as an inducement, as Judge Monnin called, or a bribe, is the synonym for that particular term, to encourage somebody to run in an election campaign. When you talk about what has happened here in convictions in the province of Manitoba, going back to 1995, I believe, I think the Liberal Party was convicted of trying to encourage or bribe one Joe Anderson of running to try and drop out of the election campaign. So they are not lily white in this process either. They have been convicted already, and now so has the Conservative Party.

\* (1550)

It is interesting to note too that Judge Monnin at first, and I was quite distressed by what I had heard at the beginning of the Monnin inquiry. Retired Justice Monnin indicated—I was quite distressed by the treatment that I saw Darryl Sutherland have to endure both at the hands of the Conservative Party and in the opening statements that were made at the Monnin inquiry. At first I saw a young man who had probably little opportunity to better himself in life. Then someone in the Conservative Party had the gall to use this individual, Darryl Sutherland, as a pawn in your political process to try and split the vote, and then to have the Conservative Party and the Premier of this

province say that Darryl Sutherland was a liar and that there was no basis for his allegations. When the Premier said he went out and investigated this matter and the only person we subsequently find out or he says that he talked to was one Taras Sokolyk. When Darryl Sutherland appeared before the opening of the inquiry and the comment that was made by retired Justice Monnin that I believe, if I am not accurate in paraphrasing, what Justice Monnin said: Darryl Sutherland, how can you expect me to believe what you are saying here?

And then, as the inquiry proceeded along its route and in the days that passed, to have all of Darryl Sutherland's testimony supported tenfold, it distressed me to see that Darryl Sutherland was treated so shabbily at the beginning of that inquiry and that we saw no apology come forward to Darryl Sutherland as a person for being used by the Conservative Party, the members of the government opposite, and that there was no apology that was given at that inquiry for the way that Darryl Sutherland was treated by those that were conducting the inquiry. I was embarrassed by our political process to see someone appearing before the inquiry questioned in such a fashion.

Darryl Sutherland, an individual who was on welfare, I believe is still receiving social assistance, living on, as the inquiry states, \$112 every two weeks, being approached by one Roland Cubby Barrett, and we will get onto Cubby Barrett's role in a few moments, and Darryl Sutherland being asked by Cubby Barrett and perhaps Allan Aitken to consider running for the Independent Native Voice Party. Darryl Sutherland had \$112 every two weeks of income, suddenly, mysteriously having \$5,000 to put towards his own election campaign as the Conservative Party members claimed, having the signs and buttons paid for by the Conservative Party supporters, having a U-drive car made available by the Conservative Party.

**An Honourable Member:** Was it a Budget Rent-a-Car?

**Mr. Reid:** No, it was not a Budget Rent-a-Car. I believe it came from Vickar Chev Olds in Transcona as well. So it is interesting. I am wondering if one Bob Kozminski walked down

the street and talked to members of that or whether it was perhaps a legitimate business transaction. Perhaps Bob did pay for it as well. How can one actually say and stand before an inquiry that Darryl Sutherland had his own resources to be able to run as a candidate, for a person who was making \$112 every two weeks? How would you ever anticipate that the public could ever believe that?

Some of the comments that were made by your long-time supporter and another PC Party fundraiser, Roland Cubby Barrett, who, it is interesting to note too that it was just a short time after the '95 election and we knew that there were some problems involving the now Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) and his former colleague, the member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), in some of the discussion that has been happening around the involvement of those two and Mr. Barrett with respect to Natural Resources in this province. We know those stories as well and your involvement in those activities, and that full story has not come out yet, so you can be on notice that somewhere down the way that story may come out and you will be part of that process.

But one Roland Cubby Barrett, by his own Premier standing there, and we have pictures of the Premier handing to Cubby Barrett the honorary life membership to the PC Party for his involvement, his good works on behalf of the Conservative Party of Manitoba. [interjection] I am not sure who Bill Moore is and perhaps you can refresh my memory. Well, let me tell you, I have been in this place since 1990. I can only represent the time that I have been here. I cannot answer for people who were here before me, and I cannot answer for people who will come to this place after me. I can only answer for my time here, my involvement in the activities here and any chance that I might have to influence any of the proceedings that would occur involving how we get to this place and our activity while we are here and how we conduct ourselves when we are here.

But to see the Premier handing an honorary life membership to Cubby Barrett for his work and then to see the Monnin inquiry report, where he said he has never seen a bigger bunch of liars in his entire career on the bench, and then to see

the Premier of the province of Manitoba handing this honorary life membership to Cubby Barrett, proud of what Mr. Barrett has done on behalf of the PC Party of Manitoba, are you not repulsed by that, by having your Premier, your Leader involved with a person who has been found guilty? If you are not, then that in itself is a statement of your ethical and moral values coming to this place.

Well, I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) just came back from a winter vacation with Cubby Barrett, where they were probably lathering sun oil over each other while they were lying on the beach of Cuba together. It is interesting to think what stories they were exchanging during their flight down and their subsequent time together perhaps over dinners in the restaurant and in their time walking through the communities in Cuba, what stories they might have been exchanging, how they are going to work together in the future and how they are going to help each other out in this process.

Yes, it is quite interesting that the Premier was going to distance, so-called distance, himself and his party from any involvement for people who were implicated and convicted in the Monnin inquiry report, and yet that does not seem to be occurring. So one has to wonder whether or not the Conservative Party and the members of the government, including cabinet ministers, have learned any lessons as a result of their election bribery and election rigging and election fixing scandal from the 1995 provincial general election. You would think you would learn some lessons from that process.

Going back to other members of the Conservative Party who were involved, one Julian Benson, you would think that Mr. Benson, who had been involved with the PC Party for quite a number of years, who after the 1995 election became the senior civil servant for the province of Manitoba—I believe that is when he took on his new mantle, his new role—you would think Mr. Benson would be smart enough to recognize as a senior civil servant for the province of Manitoba that you do not get involved in these matters; in fact you try and make sure that all of the legal processes and the laws of our province are honoured.

**An Honourable Member:** Your party passed legislation which okayed the involvement of the public service in politics. I voted against it and fought against it, but your party passed it in 1974.

**Mr. Reid:** So you think it is right for the senior civil servant of this province to go and sign cheques—

**An Honourable Member:** Your party passed the legislation making it legal.

**Mr. Reid:** You still do not get it. You still do not get it. The most trusted position outside of the cabinet in this province, the senior civil servant of this province, Julian Benson, in that capacity was there in a position of trust, as Justice Monnin says, part of the biggest bunch of liars he has ever seen in his life. It is interesting to note that Julian Benson did not have the good and common sense to stay away from your election campaign headquarters. There was absolutely no reason why he could not have said to his spouse, who was a part of your campaign, I will meet you at the door to the party headquarters, but I will not go in there, if they were going to go together for dinner that evening as he indicated through the testimony.

For Mr. Benson, as the most senior civil servant in the province of Manitoba, to go into the party headquarters under the watch of the co-chairs, the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) and the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey), under their very noses to be in there, you would think that they would know as co-chairs and as members of this Legislature that it was improper for him to be there and would have said, please, remove yourself from here; do not come here during the election campaign. You did not even have the good and common sense to tell him at that time that it was improper. Now, perhaps, you did not know what the election laws for this province are. Yet, you were charged with that responsibility to know because you were co-chairs of the election campaign.

\* (1600)

Mr. Benson says his only fault was an error in judgment. An error in judgment—what does

that mean? An error in judgment that he got caught? An error in judgment that he went into the PC Party headquarters during the election campaign? An error in judgment that he removed cheques and any reference to them from the ledgers of the PC Party? An error in judgment that he was involved in the cover up? An error in judgment that he was involved in trying to pay back those moneys into the fund and then trying to obscure the record? Or an error in judgment in talking to Mr. McFarlane and encouraging Mr. McFarlane not to ask any questions but to make sure that the cancelled cheques and the records for them were put away in a safe, secure and secret place? I do not think that is appropriate for the senior civil servant of this province.

Now, we know that Mr. Sokolyk—going back to Mr. Benson for a moment, it is interesting to note, too, that during the Monnin inquiry, as it progressed, we found out that it was not only Mr. Sokolyk's involvement in trying to bribe candidates to run and rig the election, but Mr. Benson was involved. You would think that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) would have had the good sense to ask Mr. Benson whether or not he was involved back last May or June or perhaps even back into 1995 after the election. He says he did not ask. I guess he did not want to know what was going on. It is interesting, too, and it may be interesting somewhere down the road when the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) is perhaps called to testify about her role whether or not she has passed on information to the Premier to make sure the Premier was aware of what was going on, whether or not there will be a set of silver bracelets with a short chain in between them, whether or not that will be her fate.

To have Mr. Benson being called a liar by the Premier (Mr. Filmon), and then the Premier going and holding an impromptu press conference to say, oh, no, Mr. Benson is not a liar; I made a mistake; he is not a liar. In the end, retired Justice Monnin says Mr. Benson was a liar. So, perhaps, the Premier was right in the first place, and he should not have had that impromptu press conference and should have left on the record what he had said in the first place—[interjection] Yes, I think that would be the case.



Now, Mr. Aitken and Mr. Trachuk—Mr. Aitken being the campaign manager for the Interlake and Mr. Trachuk being the candidate—could not remember. You know, the interesting part was he could not remember but his wife could, and Justice Monnin believed Kathy Aitken because she had nothing to gain by giving that testimony. He believed her to be truthful and honest. It will be interesting to see down the road, as the special prosecutor does his job, how Mr. Aitken, Mr. Benson, Mr. Trachuk, Mr. Sokolyk are viewed and whether or not there will be perjury charges and perhaps other charges laid as a result of those failures to be open, honest and truthful before the inquiry.

Justice Monnin indicated too that not only has your party and the members of your party been involved in the election rigging and the cover-up, but during the inquiry process, when you had an opportunity to be truthful and honest, you decided not to. Members of your party decided, no, we are going to stonewall the process. You drove up the cost of the inquiry, as Justice Monnin has pointed out in his report, at greater expense to taxpayers.

So there has been a cost to the taxpayer in this process. It does not seem to be important to the Conservative Party, but taxpayers paid the bill for the Monnin inquiry, and because members of your party stonewalled at every turn, you drove that cost up with no consideration for the taxpayer of this province. Those were the comments of Justice Monnin.

Now, Mr. McFarlane, it is interesting to note when I listened to the questions by my colleague the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) here this week, and Mr. McFarlane's involvement with the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey) as the official agent for the member for Fort Garry—

**An Honourable Member:** Coincidence.

**Mr. Reid:** Coincidence, that Mr. McFarlane, who was charged with the responsibility as the accountant for the PC Party for the '95 campaign, was also the official agent charged with the accounting process for the candidate for Fort Garry, just happened to be involved in the issuing of liquor licences.

Now, I could have sworn I heard in this place since we have come back to this Legislature for the continuation of this session that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said that he was going to clean up his act and that of his party and that there would be no involvement of members who were implicated in the Monnin inquiry with any further dealings with the Conservative Party. Yet we still see the involvement of Mr. McFarlane who was implicated in this process and may be facing perjury charges, Madam Speaker, as a result of—

### Point of Order

**Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship):** Madam Speaker, I would just like to clarify for the member opposite that Mr. McFarlane's firm has indeed replaced him as the auditor responsible for the MLCC. Though his firm, a reputable C.A. firm, Grant Thornton, is still the responsible accounting firm, Mr. McFarlane is no longer the auditor, and he was removed by his firm and that, in fact, as the member is trying to assess a time, I believe it was at least more than a week ago.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Fort Garry did not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Reid:** I thank the member for Fort Garry, Madam Speaker, for putting that on the record because it is interesting to note that the minister—

**An Honourable Member:** Ask her when she spoke to him last.

**Mr. Reid:** Yes, it is a good question. When did you speak to him last? Was it after Question Period yesterday and you just found out that he had been replaced? It is interesting that you did not have that information yesterday for Question Period, but you are willing to put it on the record today.

So it is interesting to note that when the decision was made, you did not have the good and common sense, since Mr. McFarlane was involved in this, and you knew or should have known, as the co-chair of the election campaign,

what was going on in this process, that Mr. McFarlane was involved. You did not have the good sense in July '98 to make sure that he was removed from any involvement in the decision making with respect to the awarding of licences. So this—

### Point of Order

**Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Sturgeon Creek):** Madam Speaker, I have been very patient here, listening to the debate. The honourable member, with due respect, has been directing questions to members on this side of the House directly rather than speaking through you, through the Chair. I would ask that you bring him to order. There is a decorum in this House, and I think that he has lost that aspect of it, and bring him to attention on that.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Transcona, on the same point of order.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Speaker, I am sure that if you were to research Hansard you will find that throughout my comments that I on many, many occasions have said Madam Speaker during the course of my comments, directing my comments through you, through the Chair, on every occasion. I will leave that to your good judgment on the researching of Hansard in that regard.

**Madam Speaker:** I will indeed take the point of order under advisement to read Hansard and consult with the authorities and report back to the House.

\* \* \*

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Transcona has one minute remaining.

**Mr. Reid:** I also listened to my colleague the member for Interlake (Mr. C. Evans) talking about the involvement of one Roland Cubby Barrett on the regional health authority advisory board, which I believe is a position that receives an honorarium or some pay for that particular work, a per diem. So when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) says that he has removed the people who were implicated in the Monnin inquiry and

no further involvement with respect to the Conservative Party or involvement in any capacity of any government department is false, and that has been shown very clearly by the questions that were here in Question Period. So with respect to the ethics of the Conservative Party, I say to the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey), you have a long way to go in developing the ethics of your party. If you ever understand what you have done to undermine the democratic processes of the province of Manitoba and what you have done to undermine the credibility of each and every member of this Legislature who comes to this place in good faith, I say to you, you should very clearly look at what you have done to destroy democracy in the province of Manitoba. Thank you.

\* (1610)

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** Madam Speaker, I am happy to be given the opportunity to put a few words on record regarding Bill 17, The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act. I am aware that the impetus for this legislation comes from former Chief Justice Monnin, the Monnin inquiry and the Monnin report. I am aware of the process, that there were some advisory committees that took a good look at the Monnin report and from it came up with some recommendations, and I think these recommendations or these directions are embodied in the two pieces of legislation before us.

It is sad, I guess, sad in the first place that we even have to deal with a bill like this, sad that these things have occurred, that the electoral process has been cheapened, that all of us I guess in the province of Manitoba feel that we have become somewhat the losers for what has happened, saddened by the fact that we, on the one hand, talk about democracy and send some of our observers to other countries to teach them the democratic procedures and processes and then find out that in our very own backyard we have not been really too observant in what has been happening. So I am saddened by that, Madam Speaker, because it seems to me that there is a culture of the winner take all. It is perhaps also embodied in some of our sports. You have to win, win at all cost, and sportsmanship is ignored, the rules are ignored, political

expediency or winning become the only game in town. I think such attitudes, whether they are embodied in sports or not, are dangerous attitudes.

Some recommendations from the Monnin inquiry and the report, we do support these: an extension of the statute of limitations from the date upon which the Chief Electoral Officer has reasonable and probable grounds to believe an offence has been committed. I think this is important because I have the feeling that some of the people who talked—I am thinking of Mr. Aitken, particularly, and Sigurdson as well—talked because they felt they were safe, they were beyond the pale of the law, the statutes had expired. Sometimes when we are dealing with these kinds of issues we have to be very careful when something expires because if there is some rot there, we would like to be able to root it out regardless of the time factor. I know this is timed but it is an improvement over the old legislation.

The second recommendation was that the Legislature move rapidly when the Chief Electoral Officer requests an amendment to the relevant statutes.

The third one, that all parties prepare a code of ethics—there is great need for this, Madam Speaker, that all political parties prepare a code of ethics because there is a culture, a dominant culture, perhaps it is a North American or northern Atlantic culture, I do not know, but it is a culture that tends to glorify the winners and tends to ignore the losers. You see that very often exhibited by the honourable members opposite forever pushing the glories of business and how business must succeed, but the reality is that for many businesses that start, also many fail. We tend to ignore the failures, and that is unfortunate because in this political process we are all of equal value. We are 57 honourable members here, and it does not matter that there is one larger group and one medium-sized group and one very small group. Each one of us is an honourable member. But when you play in this larger arena that sees only winners and losers, then very often if you lose by one vote you become insignificant according to the winners. That is unfortunate, Madam Speaker. That is a dangerous culture, the winner-take-all culture.

Even worse than that, when winning is the only game in town, when in this world of adversarial relationships and the winner takes all, then very often in order to win, the opposition is demonized and is made to look as if they were less than human or do not have any ethics or are not worthy to govern or whatever the case may be. It bothers me that people like Taras Sokolyk refer to regular sessions as peacetime and the election as wartime. It is obvious then that at the highest levels one of the Premier's confidantes obviously believes that we are in a war situation. That is unfortunate because we are a civilized group of human beings, I believe. This is not a war situation, it is merely, during an election, an attempt to convince the electorates that we have a better program than the other side has.

But we must play by the rules. It would indeed be horrible to win by cheating, and if this is what is going on, then I think we are all tarnished. I think this is what the Monnin inquiry actually uncovered that there are groups, certainly in the Tory party, at the highest reaches of the Tory party, that want to win by cheating.

I am also concerned at some of the words that some of the people that appeared before the Monnin inquiry used, words such as, well, poor judgment and so on and so on, all the euphemisms that they used, the sanitized language that they used because in their mind winning was the only game in town. That is the same sanitized language we see every night when we watch the news, and we talk about collateral damage as bombs fall on Serbia. I mean, the reality is that damage is being done, that a process is being harmed, in this case an electoral process.

I am perturbed when people like Bob Kozminski say: I would do anything. I would do anything, as long as it hurts the opposition, as long as it hurts the New Democratic Party. Such adversarial approaches, such competitive approaches, such dangerous winner-take-all approaches that do not take into account the humanity of the opposition, makes us extremely nervous, makes me extremely nervous, because that is only one short step away from demonizing the opposition. Once you demonize

somebody, it is much easier to remove them. We have had enough of that in Europe, Madam Speaker.

I was born in Holland in the early 1940s, and I just barely remember the end of that war. We know what a country can do when it dehumanizes the opposition, when it says that opposition, that group of people, whether they be gypsy or whether they be Jewish people or whether they be Catholics in terms of religion, and a group says, we do not want them, we do not like them, we want to remove them, we want to change them, we want to put them in concentration camps and so on. That is what the end process is of this dehumanization power trip, and I am really sad to see that some of that language surfaces in some of these people that were before the Monnin inquiry. It is very disconcerting, Madam Speaker.

*Mr. Gerry McAlpine, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

The fourth part of this legislation is, and I quote: that Elections Manitoba revise its reporting format and devise a method whereby all political parties and candidates properly record their sources of income and expenditures. I think that is a very reasonable proposal. Number 5, that the audit method be improved as well. We certainly have no trouble supporting that; or No. 6, the periodic investigations and audits of financial affairs and accounts of any registered political party should be undertaken by Elections Manitoba.

No. 7, Mr. Acting Speaker, the last one, "that all candidates be compelled to keep all records and documents for a period of at least five years from the date of filing a statement or return," I think that is very good, because we do not want to go through the process of, oh, we lost the records, we cannot find the records. Record shredding is an honorary tradition. I think we can go back to the Watergate scandal and so on. It is something that we do not want to participate in.

Many of the recommendations embodied in these statutes, in these bills before us, I think, are reasonable ones. We will certainly support them. Overall, the vote-rigging scheme, I think,

has not only made people more cynical, but it made a lot of people say: Well, I told you so. That is how politicians operate.

I feel very badly about that, Mr. Acting Speaker. Those kinds of shenanigans we do not need. Those kinds of shenanigans ring familiar because they remind me of Saskatchewan in the 1960s under the Ross Thatcher Liberals. I remember the gerrymandering and the ideological polarization that took place then. We happened to be, again, the party running against the Liberals who were in government, and they certainly made life difficult for us according to their approach: winner take all.

\* (1620)

Some of the things that happened, I would need a week to talk about it, but they certainly were not the kinds of things that helped the democratic process. I hoped never to see that kind of stuff again, but it appears that it is happening here in Manitoba, and hence the Monnin inquiry.

One of the honourable members mentioned just a little while ago that he was perturbed about the fact that Darryl Sutherland was treated the way he was, and it is true. It is true. If my memory is correct, when Darryl Sutherland first appeared before the Monnin inquiry, I thought I saw on TV Judge Monnin saying: Why ask the Premier? He does not know anything about this.

I thought to myself: Is that not what the inquiry is about, to see if the Premier knows something about this? I am not suggesting he did, but I thought that was what the inquiry was about. When Judge Monnin said: Do not ask him. He does not know anything about this.

At least that is the way I recall it. That sort of rang a bell in my own mind. The bell was, you know, are we not sort of prejudging the outcome of this hearing, the outcome of this inquiry? I hope that I am wrong, but there was a vote-rigging scheme. There was an aftermath, and it has tarnished the political process. It was aimed at the people who can least afford this, the people who are most disadvantaged in this province, the aboriginal people.

Now I was at the meeting the other day when the Premier apologized to the aboriginal leadership. I am glad he did, but apologies only go so far. We could have lost some seats because of this vote-rigging scheme. We could have been in an even worse situation than we are now; I guess that is what I am saying.

We are not in bad shape at all. In fact, we are looking quite great. But I am just wondering offhand how many seats we lost because of the Jets, because we had a principle position on the Jets, and, oh, no, these guys are going to save the Jets. I am saying, where the heck are the Jets? I do not know where they have gone.

I remember asking the Premier about MTS. Oh, no, we are not going to sell MTS. I remember him directly saying: We have no intention of selling MTS. Everyone in this Chamber heard it. Well, you know where MTS is. That is what I am talking about, that kind of attitude. You know, fudge, do a few side steps and think you are going to get out of it without having to tell the truth. That is what the Monnin inquiry was about.

It is disconcerting to many people, because we feel, and I think Judge Monnin felt as well, that this is just the tip of the iceberg. We did not get all the information. Not everybody was forthcoming with information. If this is indeed a total culture, if this is going on at the highest level and the aftermath is only, shucks, we got caught. Darn it. Next time we will be a little more discreet. Well, then nothing much has changed. I think we need to change the basic attitude that the winners are hot shots and that the losers are nothing. I think we need to take the game into consideration and stop some of this total, absolute, extremist, adversarial antagonisms that exist. I think that is a serious problem we face today. I do believe it was just the tip of the iceberg. I cannot prove that, but that is my feeling.

The other thing that bothers me, Mr. Acting Speaker, is, and Mr. Justice Monnin pointed it out, the "I know better" attitude. We got caught, yes, but the surliness from some of the people before the inquiry, like, how dare you question me, I am a Tory, I am a Tory hotshot.

That really bothered me because then it sounds almost like, well, I got caught. It is just too bad I got caught, but I would do it again if I had to. Certainly that is the attitude that Mr. Bob Kozminski displayed, and I felt the same thing coming out of Mr. Aitken. The lying and the untruth and the fudging and the cheating is okay as long as you do not get caught.

Well, I do not subscribe to that theory. That is a pretty selective way of looking at the world, I believe, and I hope it is not a pattern that is ingrained at the highest levels of the party opposite. I do not want to give the impression that we have a monopoly on virtue—I do not believe any political party does—but we all want to play by the rules and we want to play fairly.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I cannot emphasize strongly enough the fact, when I talk about my background, being born in Europe and Holland during the war, that I know what it is like to live in a country where there is no democracy.

*Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

It is easy to take democracy for granted. When you are living in it, you are a fish in the water. You have to be out of the water a little while before you realize what you are missing. But the Tories playing fast and loose with democratic rules, with saying the winner must take all, we have a divine right to rule, is just plain wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We do not on this side of the House subscribe to those kinds of values. We think that if you view this process as total and all-out war, this election process, then truth will become the first casualty, as it is probably already becoming the first casualty right now when the bombs are raining down on Serbia. No one gains by these kinds of shenanigans. I think we are all the losers because of it.

I think we have to be very careful because democracy has been a long process, and sometimes when we are in the process, we take a lot for granted. Political parties in power assume that the first time around they are quite careful, the second time around they are pretty carefree, the third time around they think they have a

divine right to rule. But you do not have a divine right to rule, and when you play with the rules the way I think they were played with, you are in trouble.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Manitoba know there is something rotten in the state of Denmark, and I think the Monnin inquiry merely pointed that out, merely emphasized the fact, what people already knew. I decry in the strongest terms this I-will-do-anything-to-make-the-NDP-lose attitude. In fact, my honourable colleague for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) said, I suppose somewhat jokingly just a moment ago, Tory ethics are an oxymoron, but then I remind him so is progressive and conservative, because that is a left and a right hand put together, I guess.

What concerns me also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this process of digging out the rot that obviously occurred in the 1995 election, when people played fast and loose with the truth, is that senior members of the Tory party were involved. We are not talking about just ordinary hacks. We are talking about the senior levels of the Tory party. They were caught with their hand in the cookie jar, and instead of showing remorse, many of them are showing defiance, saying, well, we got caught, darn it, as if there was nothing wrong with what they did. Well, there was a lot wrong with what they did, and if they cannot see what the problem is, that party over there is in deeper trouble than I think they already are, and they are in trouble deep enough.

I do not like the sort of sanitized language that is being used or was being used by people in front of the Monnin inquiry, stuff like errors in judgment. Oh, shucks, I just did not tell the Premier and so on and so on. We are talking about organized vote rigging at the highest level. We are talking about compromising the democratic process at the highest level. We are talking about tarnishing something that all of us should hold sacred. It is indeed regrettable that we have to deal with Bill 17 and support it, and we will support it because it brings to light what people have known for a long time, the cynicism that people have felt, that politicians playing fast and loose with the rules was indeed true in this case of people in the Tory party at the highest levels, perhaps not all of them, but certainly

enough of them to make us suspicious that it was more organized than they let on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to conclude now by saying that the democratic process is important to all of us, that fair elections are important to all of us, that just before an election, promises that never materialize when you know they are not going to materialize are wrong, that the Tory government engaged in this. I do not know where the Jets are today that were promised.

**An Honourable Member:** They are in Phoenix.

**Mr. Jennissen:** Well, I guess they are. They are in Phoenix. I am sorry. They have not risen from the ashes as the phoenix of old was supposed to have done. The phoenix of old, I guess, the Tory party, I think, is a little bit like that, but I do not think they are going to rise from the ashes.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will close now by saying that the people in my constituency were perturbed about what happened with this vote-rigging scandal. We hope it never happens again. We will take the word of the people opposite that they are indeed going to try and fix the party, change it. I think, as the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) says, perhaps, the best way, the most efficient way, is to just vote them out of existence, then we do not have to worry about what they will do next because they are just like a cat with nine lives. They have used up all nine in Saskatchewan, and I think they have just about used all of them here as well. However, I think in Saskatchewan, there is a bit of room left in some of those jails, but who knows?

\* (1630)

I think this is indeed a serious matter. We will support this bill. We hope that we never again face such scandals which have cast a dark shadow on the political process in this province. We will support this bill, and we hope that never again in the history of Manitoba we will see the kinds of things that we saw in 1995, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you.

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** I will just, Mr. Deputy Speaker, take a few minutes to put a few words on the record. First of all, I have sat here and listened to the debate, and I concur that the legislation that is being brought forward is the kind of legislation we probably should have brought forward many years ago.

I am somewhat concerned that much of the rhetoric that we have heard in the House here today will paint us all as politicians with a brush that all of us will not want to be painted with. It will cause people to be much more sceptical about us as politicians and indeed taint our profession no matter who made the statements. It will not matter which side of the House we sit on, we as legislators will be viewed, in my view, by my constituents and by all of your constituents, indeed, all Manitobans, as being people that do not want to tell the truth. Much of what I have heard would lead me to believe that much of what has been put on the record is, in fact, not factual. That concerns me when we as legislators deliberately portray ourselves as the kind of people that cannot be trusted, and that is what has happened in this House over the last week or so while we have debated this piece of legislation.

As a member of the Legislature, who has a family out there, and I have grandkids, to sit and listen to the kind of rhetoric that I have heard in here would demonstrate to them that we are not, as I have heard before, an honourable profession. I think we should all take a great deal of care as to what we, in fact, say about each other in these chambers because everything we say will be recorded and will indeed be used in a historical manner at some point in time to portray us as we really are, as we really deserve to be portrayed. I think that includes you on the opposition benches as well as us on this side of the House.

That causes me a great deal of difficulty, because I came here thinking that we could be deliberate, that we could be direct, and indeed we could be serious about the issue. I always thought that we would in fact be able to be factual, and that has been proved not to be the case. I think that is sad. That is a sad comment and it is a sad day in this House when we have to say that about ourselves.

Secondly, I want to just very briefly touch on one thing that has concerned me from the time before we sat in this House. There has been much criticism extended by the press and by opposition members and others about the time that we stayed out of the House. I just want to read into the record the record of the previous government, the Pawley government. In 1982, was there a fall session? [interjection] In 1982, yes, there was a fall session by the Pawley government. They sat, and the time between sessions was five months. In 1983, was there a fall session? No, there was no fall session; lapsed time between sessions was four months. This is the Pawley record. In 1984, end of session was June 29 and they stayed out for eight months, one week. In 1985, there was no fall session, and they stayed out for 10 months. I think that is longer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than we stayed out this time. In 1986, no fall session, and they stayed out five months. In 1987, no fall session, and they stayed out seven months. Again, I think we need to reflect on the honesty with which we portray the issues in this House and outside of the House. I want to also—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sure the honourable member realizes that we are dealing with Bill 17 and he might want to relate to me how this relates to Bill 17.

**Mr. Penner:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will raise two other issues very briefly and then I will quit. They have to do with Bill 17 and the reason we are putting Bill 17 in place.

In an election, where our now Minister of Finance ran in an election, there was a person that was actually working for a Liberal member that was accused of bribery and indeed convicted and fined \$2,900, because he attempted to bribe somebody not to run in an election. That is factual. These are records.

In 1986-87, there was a then minister of the Crown, and the case I think is still being considered for appeal, and the minister in question was a fellow by the name of John Bucklaschuk. The whole matter had to do with how they were going to try and hide an amount of roughly about \$12.4 million which showed up in the IBNR at Autopac. I think that again demonstrates that we are all fallible and we are,

from time to time, going to cause this kind of thing to happen. That is the reason why we are putting this kind of legislation in place, because it behooves us all when we enter this place to be as forthright and honest as the people expect us to be when they put us here to represent them.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you for the few short minutes that you have given me to put those comments on the record. Thank you.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, a bit surprised by the previous speech and a bit surprised that he would react as he had to the comments made by members on this side, who were victims of the alleged vote-rigging attempt in the 1995 election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not rhetoric to us. What happened in 1995 is not rhetoric. It is not a debate in a legislative Chamber devoid from the realities that took place in Interlake, Swan River and Dauphin. It is something that people lived. They lived, the people in the Conservative Party recruiting and running three individuals under the Native Voice banner. They lived with Conservative organizers providing signs and putting up signs in their community and having materials available. As we were to find out later, one of them was funded. One of them was induced to run, bribed to run in a campaign against a fellow MLA. That is why this law is here now—[interjection] Yes, you are darn right it hurt all MLAs.

Why are we going through this today? When this issue developed in 1995, it should have been dealt with at that time because the Interlake newspapers included coverage and admissions from people that, yes, they were giving advice to. They were not giving resources to, they were giving advice to the candidates, trying to give them a little help to run in a democracy. Kind of the Tory-campaign candidate, I think it was, admitted and the campaign organizer admitted that they, in fact, were giving democratic advice to people who were running in those constituencies.

So why then did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) not bring in his chief of staff and the principal secretary or the chief of staff in his office and the

campaign manager of the Conservative Party? Why did they not go through it at that time? Why did he not make it clear to all his senior staff that were involved that he wanted to get to the bottom of it, to really find out whether this, in fact, happened, or did he just choose to turn the other way?

\* (1640)

The member who just spoke had a chance two years ago in a debate. The first time and the only time I moved a motion to delete money in the Premier's Estimates was dealing with Mr. Sokolyk, in 1997, where I cited the problems of letter-writing campaigns and phone calls to open-line shows and other issues of questionable ethical standards being run out of the Premier's office. It was the case of Ron Arnst phoning as a constituent of Crescentwood and claiming to be some constituent of Crescentwood, and why Avis Gray was running. The then Deputy Premier, the co-chair of the election campaign, I heard him on the radio saying: Oh, I do not recognize that voice. That could not be anybody out of our office. Of course, who was running this kind of Nixonian kind of dirty tricks campaign then? Why did we on this side have to move a motion to delete his salary two years ago? Why do people opposite stand with the Premier and his chief of staff and his campaign manager? Why did you not join with us and say there is something rotten in the state of Denmark, and we are going to do something about it?

*Madam Speaker in the Chair*

So you had your chance, sir, to prevent this. You had your chance to vote with our side, to vote to delete that salary in 1997. You know, we have not moved a motion. I, as Leader of the Opposition, have never moved a motion to delete a salary in the Premier's office since I have been in this job, in this responsibility. You had a chance to vote with the caucus and with this kind of, I would argue, ethically challenged individual; you could vote with the Premier or you could vote with us to stop this.

So, when the member says this has been bad for MLAs, you are darn right it has. I do not like my daughter asking about cheating. The word



"rigging" does not come out of her mouth, but she watches the news and she hears these stories about cheating in an election campaign. I do not like our neighbours to think that any of us are involved in political parties that cheat and bribe and cover up and then lie and lie and lie again.

It is not good for all of us, but what members opposite have to realize is that if they had conducted a thorough investigation, if members of the caucus—[interjection] You could stand up now, but why did you not stand up to the Premier four years ago? Why did you not stand up two years ago to the Premier? Why did you stick your hand up to vote for Taras Sokolyk's salary two years ago? You had a choice, sir. You failed. You failed to make the right decision when you voted to put money back into Taras Sokolyk's line in his Estimates two years ago in this Chamber.

You failed too. Why do we understand the ethically challenged chief of staff for the Premier from this side of the House before members opposite understand the ethically challenged standards from that side of the House? Why, I ask you? I do not understand it. I wonder if you have had a real honest discussion in your caucus about this. I wonder if you have had a real frank discussion. I wonder if the Premier has admitted to you that he chose people that consistently, year after year, practised in these kind of deceitful ways, phoning talk shows with people out of the Premier's office, having letters being written for somebody else to sign, all these kinds of Nixonian tricks that were coming out of that office.

That is not the tradition of the Progressive Conservative Party of Duff Roblin. That is not the tradition of the Progressive Conservative Party under Sterling Lyon, but that is now the tradition of the Progressive Conservative Party under the member for Tuxedo, Gary Filmon, in this latest incident.

**An Honourable Member:** Sterling would have dealt with this.

**Mr. Doer:** Sterling Lyon understood the difference. Sterling Lyon understood the difference between being a public employee for the purposes of acting in the public interests and

being the clerk of the Treasury Board and acting interchangeably in his role as a civil servant responsible for the public and a role as working directly in the campaign of the Conservative Party.

Judge Monnin was able to see through Mr. Benson's testimony, when he said, oh, I did not understand the oath of office of being a civil servant. I did not understand this act. I did not understand the act that prohibited deputy ministers from participating in fundraising and electioneering under The Civil Service Act. What did the Premier do about that? He was asked under oath whether he referred this matter to the Civil Service Commission. He was asked under oath, and he said, I will deal with this issue. Five weeks later he did not deal with it, and he let Mr. Benson retire rather than being dismissed, because he had breached The Civil Service Act.

So this is not rhetoric that the member opposite talks about in this Chamber. These are real life violations of The Elections Act. These are real life inducements and bribery for candidates in a democracy. This is real life cover-up conducted by the head of the Treasury Board and the senior staff in the Conservative office.

These are serious allegations that require serious legislative changes. You are darn right, it hurt all of us. You are darn right it did, and that is a disgrace that it hurt all of us. Members opposite that think this is just rhetoric—it really makes me mad because that is what they said last June. They said last June that the NDP was just electioneering. They said last June we were just politicking. They said last June that Darryl Sutherland was wrong. They said last June that there was nothing to these allegations, and we are just playing politics—[interjection] Well, we cannot wait either, Madam Minister, call the election. Call the election. We are not afraid to face the people. [interjection] I do not know what they put in those flowers, Madam Speaker, that they have got around the Chamber here, but I would like to proceed with my speech on a very serious topic, if I might.

Madam Speaker, page 16 of the Monnin report: "In all my years on the Bench I never encountered as many liars in one proceeding as I

did in this inquiry." It is disheartening indeed to realize that an oath to tell the truth means so little to some people. Now, who was responsible for those people who lied so much under oath that Judge Monnin had to make those comments? Who was responsible for hiring those people? The Premier (Mr. Filmon) was the person who appointed the campaign manager. Was he appointed by somebody else? No, he was appointed by the Premier. The Premier was responsible for hiring and selecting the head of the Treasury Board, the Secretary to the Treasury Board. It is right on the Order-in-Council signed G.A. Filmon. Who was responsible for selecting the treasurer for the Conservative Party? Who was responsible for giving a meritorious award to one Cubby Barrett, who was also responsible and named under this inquiry?

\* (1650)

Who was a close personal friend of the Premier's, who was also responsible for fundraising in the Conservative Party, who was cited by Monnin for his ethically challenged comments that he would do anything to win an election campaign? A former past co-chair of the Keystone fundraising activity and, obviously, a person who benefited greatly from Tory decisions, the Immigrant Investment Fund and other decisions, and who, also responsible for Shelter Corporation, was also responsible for writing cheques.

Now, you know, does anybody believe that a person could hire a principal secretary or chief of staff, make him the campaign manager, select an accountant, have a person that they hire as the former treasurer of the Conservative Party and make him partially responsible for election cheques and later election cover-ups and election ads, and have a situation where another individual, the former official agent and the other co-chair of the election committee, is the accountant, who is responsible again and cited for cover-up in the report, and then have your two best friends that are involved in writing cheques, and you do not know about it? I mean, my best friends, they—[interjection]

Well, Madam Speaker, the lawyer, the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe) across

the way, did ask about Monnin. Well, former Justice Monnin said he still today does not believe that he has got all the evidence that is available to come forward. I would mention to the member opposite there is a previous scandal, regrettably, in this Legislature dealing with the building of this Legislature and the building of Kelly House. There, too, the Premier was not initially cited by the investigation or the inquiry. Rodmond Roblin was not cited in the initial investigation.

**An Honourable Member:** What do the facts say?

**Mr. Doer:** Well, the facts say that all the evidence is not in. The facts say to me that in the court of public opinion, when seven people that you hired or your close personal friends know about it, people might give you the benefit of the doubt if one person says the Premier did not know about it or two people said they might not know about it, but seven, I will go with the people every day of the week.

Madam Speaker, the former co-chair of the Conservative Party, you know, did he not know who Jules Benson was? This guy came into the office how many times; a hundred times, a hundred cheques he signed. Had you never seen him before? Had the Premier not introduced you to Mr. Jules Benson? The other co-chair, the minister, did she not meet the former secretary to the Treasury Board? The minister was responsible for \$300,000 in advertising being paid to Foster Marks by the Industry, Trade and Tourism department. Was Jake Marks not involved in the advertising in the Conservative campaign? Was Jules Benson not cited as a person who visited the advertisers as a nonpartisan civil servant in the inquiry? Is Mr. Downey now saying, the member for Arthur-Virden, he did not know that Jake Marks and Jules Benson were meeting together while he was co-chair of the campaign?

You know, there are lots of questions we could ask the former Deputy Premier. There are lots of questions we would like to ask him, and he is going silently into the night, out into the west. He is riding off into the west, and Mr. Monnin has said there are lots of evidence that is not before him yet that he does not know. He

does not believe that all the evidence is in yet about this issue. How the former Deputy Premier could not know that Mr. Benson was involved in this campaign, contrary to The Civil Service Act, again defies plausible deniability in our view in this affair.

Madam Speaker, the Monnin report recommends that we go from two-year statute of limitations to multiyear, five years and more. We agree with that. The public believes the lawmakers should not use technicalities to hide lawbreakers from the law. We want every lawbreaker brought before the justice system and prosecuted to the full extent of the law. We do not believe that technicalities and two-year limitations in the elections law should prevent people that worked and were hired by lawmakers opposite from being able to hide from potentially lawbreaking activity. This applies directly to the inducement or the bribe in this campaign. It relates directly to Mr. Sokolyk, Mr. Aitken and Mr. Barrett, who we believe broke Section 145(1) of The Elections Act by inducing Darryl Sutherland to run.

You know, it is not just Judge Monnin who said that these individuals broke the law. The lawyer for Elections Manitoba said that the Progressive Conservative Party broke the Manitoba election laws. In his submission to the final days of the Monnin inquiry, the lawyer representing Mr. Balasko, the independent chief executive officer of Elections Manitoba, went from taking the position that they had taken last June that it was a thorough investigation, and nine months later after they heard all the evidence came back said the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba broke the election laws. You know who is responsible in the election laws for the administration of those laws? The Leader. The Leader is responsible for the party's maintaining the election laws of Manitoba. I do not understand why you people have not had this debate in your caucus, in your party, in your convention. I do not understand why you do not understand that you have a Premier who is the Leader of a party that Elections Manitoba has claimed broke the law.

We go out every day and ask our young kids to follow the law. We go out every day in our community clubs and ask people to follow the

law. We go out every day and say that there are consequences for people who are responsible for following the law.

Elections Manitoba said the Conservative Party of Manitoba broke the law. Now, who are you holding accountable for this? The person who appointed the campaign manager? The secretary of the Treasury Board? The accountant for the Progressive Conservative Party whose best friends wrote the cheques? I mean, what happens there? Where is the issue of conscience in the party, in the caucus? Why do you believe that the public will not hold you accountable if you do not hold your own Leader accountable, because I think history has been written in public affairs and politics when people themselves do not hold leaders or ministers or others accountable for major public affronts to democracy or integrity in government, that the whole party will then suffer.

I do not understand members opposite not taking on this issue with the Leader. I do not understand why you have not taken this on with the Leader. So we therefore support, regrettably, the necessity of passing on an urgent basis a statute of limitation whose net would then include in future the activity of members opposite. I will stop there.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. I was calling it five o'clock, exactly.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I believe there might be leave not to see the clock while we finalize this bill.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave of the House not to see the clock? [agreed] Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. Doer:** It felt like it was the Telephone debate again. I am sorry, I withdraw that statement. I withdraw because I did not get a chance to speak then. I take it back.

The second area of this bill that again we are dealing with is the whole issue of records being kept for five years. Now, I cannot believe that people in trust would cover up records. I cannot believe that the former chief of staff and the

head of Treasury Board would be involved in getting rid of financial transactions after the election campaign when they knew that Elections Manitoba was going to proceed with an investigation.

I could not believe, Madam Speaker, when I heard during the testimony of one of the Conservative organizers that they had lost two file cabinets. They had misplaced two file cabinets and could not find them. Now, this is the group of people opposite who always talk about, you know, we are new, we are modern, we are up to date and we are this and we are that. You lose two file cabinets full of records. What do you do with two file cabinets? How do they disappear? And what kind of a system do you have over there?

**An Honourable Member:** What did Bucklaschuk do with his papers?

**Mr. Doer:** Well, they were certainly in the Archives office.

Madam Speaker, we agree with the law that says that records must be kept for over five years, and we will support this amendment to the act. We further will support the recommendation that CEO recommendations must be dealt with on a more timely basis.

Again, if this party is trying to clean up its act from the revelations of the Monnin inquiry, and nobody is suggesting that anybody is absolutely perfect, and I am not suggesting that for any of us, but we should strive to be perfect. We should strive to do what is right under the law, but why do we now see in Manitoba a recommendation that was put forward by the CEO of Elections Manitoba to have independently appointed chief returning officers? Why do we not see that recommendation implemented? Why are we continuing in the old ways of patronage with returning officers after the Chief Electoral Officer has recommended that we proceed accordingly?

We certainly support the ideas of having inspections and audits, and maybe if the chief executive officer of Elections Manitoba could have audited the Conservative books at an earlier point, we would not have seen the records disappear and therefore we would not have had this situation four years later that required us to

have a very expensive and very gruelling inquiry into the affairs of the 1995 election campaign.

We certainly support the idea of having ethical kinds of codes by each party. We have conflict-of-interest guidelines in our own party that have been passed in our own Constitution and in our own party affairs. It means that people dealing with matters—[interjection] Well, that is under the act. The Leader is responsible under The Elections Act. I know that the Deputy Premier who was responsible for the last campaign is the new ethics chair of the Conservative Party. I do not want to go there, out of charity to the minister from Arthur-Virden, a person whose honesty I always respected. I always respected his honesty. I can still remember his statement, why should I hire my enemies when I can hire my friends, in dealing with patronage appointments, much more refreshing than the answers we got from the minister of cultural affairs yesterday in trying to defend some of the decisions they made.

We certainly support the idea of amendments coming forward on a timely basis. I would say that there was some controversy over a code of ethics on political signs. I respect the fact that some parts of our community will have a situation where they will put different political signs on their lawns from different political parties. We are not opposed to different families having the right to put two or three or four signs on their lawn if they choose. I know my mother used to have one political sign on our lawn, and my father used to have another political sign on our lawn. I thought it was actually quite interesting as a young person to grow up with that. Obviously, the rule that you hear, that I will vote the same way as my spouse is voting, was not the rule in our family. It never was and it never would be.

But I think it is wrong to have a situation where one political party produces signs for two political candidates and pays for those signs. That was the point that the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) was trying to make. We are not opposed to different cultures taking different signs and different families taking different signs. I have been in by-elections in The Maples where people have said, go ahead, put a sign up on my lawn. That is okay because the culture is to say yes, not to say no, and that is

different than what I was used to with my parents who wanted their own sign up, because of their own political convictions, as opposed to the kind of hospitable culture that we have in a lot of our communities. So, certainly, we support those recommendations on ethics as well.

Madam Speaker, the culture in the Conservative Party has to be addressed in this code of ethics, the winning at all costs, that this was an election outside of peace time, the ends justify the means, statements by Mr. Kozminski, Mr. Thorsteinson. The gist of this certainly cannot help the Tory candidate. It was no secret that a lot of the First Nations vote was in favour of the New Democratic Party. It was the reason for signing a cheque.

Madam Speaker, these kinds of comments show us that the culture in the Conservative Party is win at all costs. We should be competitive. We should be feisty in our beliefs. We should put up strong candidates who believe strongly in their principles and values and policies, but winning at all costs is not part of a democracy. That is part of an antidemocratic way of winning election campaigns.

Madam Speaker, we believe that the statements made by Justice Monnin have got to be the way in which we deal with this bill, that Justice Monnin basically said that this was an attempt in 1995 at vote splitting which was unethically and morally reprehensible. "Political mores have reached a dangerous low when one party member can actively support his party, but sees nothing objectionable in helping to finance and organize the candidate of a second party in order to harm a third party," page 11.

"I cannot ignore the fact that throughout this episode, especially during the investigation and at the hearings, some of these witnesses exhibited a degree of arrogance or an 'I know better attitude.'"

Madam Speaker, the statement he made about the oath of office and liars, unethical behaviour and morally reprehensible, I think, is a real regrettable condemnation on members opposite and the political party that they are responsible for. They have a choice of what to do. They have a choice of whether to hold their Leader accountable, and we have a choice to pass this bill.

But, ultimately, we trust the people. Ultimately, we trust the people to pass judgment on all of us, and I am very confident that, when people have a chance to vote for a party that had practised such a blatant disregard for democratic principles and then tried to cover it up after or for other political parties that try to do better, they will choose a new way to go and a new tomorrow in terms of democracy.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. We will be supporting this bill, and we are prepared to pass this bill through second reading to committee stage, which, I understand, is scheduled for Monday evening. Thank you.

\* (1710)

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 17. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### House Business

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on House business, I would like to announce that the Committee on Privileges and Elections is called for Monday, next Monday, at 7 p.m., the committee room to be announced, to give consideration to Bill 17.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, I think if you canvass the House, you will see there is a will to call it six o'clock.

**Madam Speaker:** First, I will repeat the instruction to the House regarding House business, that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet on Monday next, April 26, at 7 p.m. in the committee room to be announced.

Is it the will of the House to call it 6 p.m.? [agreed]

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 22, 1999

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### Ministerial Statements

Earth Day McIntosh	551
Dewar	552

Littleton, Colorado, Tragedy McCrae	552
Mackintosh	553
Lamoureux	553

#### Tabling of Reports

Manitoba Foundation Annual Report; Supplementary Loan and Guarantee Authority Report; Manitoba Hospital Capital Financing Authority Auditor's Report; Debt Retirement Fund Annual Report; Enabling Appropriations and Other Appropriations Annual Report Gilleshammer	554
--	-----

'97-98 annual reports, Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism; Annual Report, Manitoba Industry, Trade and Tourism; Annual Report, Cooperative Promotion Board; Annual Report, Co-operative Loans and Loans Guarantee Board; Annual Report, Manitoba Development Corporation; Annual Report, Manitoba Trade; Annual Report, Industrial Technology Centre; Annual Report, Economic Innovation and Technology Council Tweed	554
--	-----

#### Oral Questions

Home Care Workers Doer; Stefanson	554
Chomiak; Stefanson	555
Sale; Stefanson	557

Lynn Lake Hospital Foundation Jennissen; Stefanson	558
---	-----

Lynn Lake Hospital Jennissen; Stefanson	558
--	-----

Emerson Health Care Facility Lamoureux; Stefanson	559
--	-----

Unemployment Rate—Aboriginals L. Evans; Gilleshammer	560
---	-----

Aboriginal Communities Friesen; McCrae; Newman	562
---	-----

Child Poverty Rate Martindale; Mitchelson	562
--	-----

<b>Speaker's Rulings</b> Dacquay	563
-------------------------------------	-----

#### Members' Statements

National Organ Donation Discussion Day Laurendeau	564
--	-----

Wasagamack Helicopter Accident Robinson	564
--	-----

Winnipeg Police Service Anniversary Kowalski	565
---	-----

Order of Sports Excellence Award Dyck	565
--	-----

National Child Care conference McGifford	566
---	-----

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Report Stage

Bill 2—The Electoral Divisions Amendment Act	566
---	-----

#### Debate On Second Readings

Bill 17—The Elections Amendment and Elections Finances Amendment Act	
---	--

<b>Martindale</b>	<b>567</b>
<b>Reid</b>	<b>574</b>
<b>Jennissen</b>	<b>582</b>
<b>Penner</b>	<b>587</b>
<b>Doer</b>	<b>588</b>