

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10 a.m., Friday, June 11, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students, Grade 13 standing of the Cornerbrook Junior High School of Devlin, Ontario under the direction of Mr. Harry Clue.

We also have 30 students, Grade 9 standing of the Jefferson High School under the direction of Mr. Zuke. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Urban Affairs.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Logan.

REPORT BY STANDING COMMITTEE

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on June 10, 1976, and heard representation with respect to the Bills referred as follows:

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Trade Practices Inquiry Act: Mr. G. R. Hunter, Q.C. - Imperial Oil Limited et al, Mr. D. J. Jessiman, Q.C. - Gulf Oil Limited et al.

No. 81 - The Milk Control Act: Mr. Don Lynch - Manitoba Dairy and Poultry Co-operative Ltd., Mr. D. A. Speirs - Modern Dairies Ltd.

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 84 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Trade Practices Inquiry Act,

No. 80 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act (2),

No. 81 - The Milk Control Act,

No. 89 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1976),

No. 91 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and The Petty Trespasses Act,

No. 94 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act (2) and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable First Minister.

TABLING OF REPORT - RETURNS TO ORDERS FOR RETURN

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have here a compendium of Orders for Return, being 19 in number, on the motions of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you'd kindly call Bill No. 79 on Page 2 of the Order Paper.

BILL NO. 79 - GRANTING OF FISCAL MONEYS

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I welcome one more occasion to address a few remarks to honourable members opposite. It's a fine morning to do them on for those of us who didn't have to serve until the hour of 3, I understand, on the Law Amendments Committee. Having been exempted from that onerous duty I was able to get back to the fresh air of the country to collect my wisdom and my thoughts and enjoy a full night's rest. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity that this bill provides for us is to, with some depth and some range, discuss the affairs of the Province of Manitoba insofar as that we are dealing with the Supply Motion that deals with all the aspects of departments of government.

I would like at the outset to indicate that I think some mention should be made to the fact of how well the new rules are working with respect to the consideration that Estimates are being given under these new rules. Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have examined as Her Majesty's loyal opposition should, all department, some at greater depth. But certainly we had that capacity and availability to examine all departments, the spending Estimates thereof.

Mr. Speaker, a point has been made from time to time by the opposition that there's a concern for the level of spending that this government has allowed itself to develop. I recall the Honourable Minister of Mines telling us that all things are relative, that their spending was not that much out of line in terms of increase as was our administration spending if compared to the decade previous. That of course has some element of truth to it. But, Mr. Speaker, what the people and the residents of Manitoba are asking themselves at the same time they're being asked to contribute to this record level of spending of well over a billion dollars is, has in fact the level of service and has the quality of service kept pace with that increase in spending.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that's a question that we can debate ad infinitum and we no longer will be debating that too long in the course of this session but that is the kind of question that the electors themselves answer for themselves as they either bump along our bumpy roads in certain parts of Manitoba, as they worry about the high burden of property taxes, whether it's attributable particularly to the field of education where this government has shown a particular lack of concern in terms of alleviating that situation. Those are subject matters that the electors themselves are becoming more and more aware of and in my judgment are coming down harshly in judgment on this government as saying that the level of service, the quality of service has not tripled or quadrupled as has this government's tax imposition, as has this government's revenue.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, in modesty it can be said that the opposition has had some fair success in the pinpointing of some of the weaknesses that are developing in this government. I would have to take particular note of the work done and the consideration for the Department of Education. Again, Mr. Speaker, what seems to be developing, at least in our minds and we can only reflect that development because we feel it back home among our constituents, among the people of Manitoba in general, is that there is a growing concern in such departments of education, not simply with the financing of that major social effort that this government and all governments have to address themselves to, but in fact the very direction of it and the programming of it. That, Mr. Chairman, I think was amply underlined during the course of the consideration of that department's Estimates.

The almost total lack of the Department of Industry and Commerce, the disappearance you might say, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that is becoming apparent as this government gets older and older is another area that I think members in the opposition express a view that is causing growing alarm and growing

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont'd) consideration in many parts of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, when this government speaks about its economic development programs, when this government speaks about its job creating programs, it speaks generally only of itself and its immediate agencies, MDC operated agencies, government itself, departments of government themselves, Crown agencies but that role that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should be championing in this Chamber has simply disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, we who sit opposite these honourable gentlemen are not that suprised that that is the case. Because despite the lip service that they give to the concept of a mixed economy, both private and public, their actions belie their words. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when you listen to the individual comments, whether they come from the Member from Thompson or whether they come from other members, one hears nothing but negative remarks with respect to the private sector. Have you ever heard from our members of the north who represent the seats where our mining industry is located one kindly word about the mining industry? Not one, Sir. Not one. So really if you talk about this concept that the First Minister likes, to in his more moderate tone present, that he favours a blend of a mixed economy of a healthy private and a vigorous public sector, he's not getting that message across to his own colleagues. I must tell him the people of Manitoba, as much as they listen to the First Minister, they also hear the rest of the members of that government from time to time and they are spreading the message that I am reflecting to you now in this summarization of a consideration of Estimates.

I think, Mr. Speaker, nowhere is this particular concern more deeply felt than in the field of mining. I think that the future for the mining industry is bleak. Unfortunately it's the kind of situation that only time will tell as it is beginning to tell.

There is one interesting feature that, again through reasonable diligent work on the part of the opposition at committee stages, we glean from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and that is the special bonus arrangements that were arrived at with respect to our mining company, our public mining company. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the correctness of those arrangements. In fact the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has so indicated and I believe it to be true, that these arrangements are nothing out of order, that these arrangements are normally entered into in the private sector.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I keep asking myself, where does this government expect the public to get that tremendous windfall benefit by going public or making it a public government-owned corporation. If we're arriving at the same kind of special bonus clauses that presidents and major shareholders in the private sector arrive at for themselves - 20 percent of the action for the boss, another 20 percent for the chief geologist - if, Mr. Speaker, as I know, we are paying our employees the same level of wages competitive with the rest of the industry; if, Mr. Speaker, our costs are the same in terms of exploration and finding and development are the same; if our contribution to the tax purse are in keeping with the rest of industry and we're providing our chief officers with those bonus clauses that give them 20 percent of the action; I ask myself, where is that great benefit that's supposed to accrue to the public purse that is currently being ripped up by the corporate bums? Mr. Speaker, it must become self-evident, it simply isn't there. If the Mines and Resources Minister prides himself on making arrangements that are no different than those that are currently made in the private sector, and I believe him, I am just somewhat puzzled to know how the public is going to get all that in between dollars that members opposite are so obsessed with are being funnelled off and away from the public sector. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, those specific benefits that members opposite seem to see.

Mr. Speaker, I'm dealing in this way, as I wander through the Estimates, with some of the matters and questions that have taken time in this Chamber. While it's not a specific one with respect to a department it's scattered, in this instance, with several Ministers' responsibilities.

But, Sir, I raise the question of lotteries in this wrap-up speech, their management, their proliferation and indeed, Mr. Speaker, their morality. I remind honourable members that the question of lotteries was first introduced in this Chamber on a free vote

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont'd) as a matter of conscience and there was some debate at that time. It was a fairly divided House, members on both sides expressing their opinions about it and voting in that manner in a very free way. I only mention this in passing not wishing to dwell on it any longer.

But surely there has to be some concern beginning to develop about the proliferation of lotteries, the extent that it seems that we have become so ready to accept that this is a fair and equitable way of raising public dollars to do public service. I just leave it in passing that it wasn't that long ago that the morality of having governments lean on this source of income, this kind of a tax, was a matter of some concern, was a matter of some question by legislators, some of whom are still present in this Chamber --(Interjection)--.

Mr. Speaker, I will not quarrel with the Honourable First Minister. I simply say that we have now got lotteries pushed at us in much the same objectionable way as some of my honourable friends opposite sometimes say the private sector pushes pink toothbrushes or soups or candy bars or what have you, at you. It seems when one is attempting to watch a favourite TV show, one of the major interrupters of that show is some government agency pushing some particular lottery --(Interjection)-- or maybe a rebate program as I'm told. Mr. Speaker, as I say, that's not the subject matter that I want to deal with at some length.

Mr. Speaker, I think we want to talk just briefly about the Department of Agriculture. There's no question, Mr. Speaker - and it was demonstrated again last night - that we have a very vigorous, active, determined, yes, Mr. Speaker, even a militant Minister. We have members on this side of the House who are prepared to match that determination and militancy. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful whether there has ever been a Minister of Agriculture or Department that has pumped and spent more money into the farm sector than this Minister. It's also doubtful, Mr. Speaker, if ever the case was proven that money doesn't buy votes, this Minister is proving it. This Minister and this government is proving it and the First Minister should be aware of it. It's a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister - and he is being given that head room by his First Minister - to allow doctrinaire positions to be put forward on the farm scene when they are not acceptable to the vast majority of farm people.

Despite the sweet honey of grants, of outright financial support, the dairy farmers of this province rejected his proposals of the Crocus plant and displayed a great deal of wisdom in so doing. Mr. Speaker, those of us who fought that issue with this government and this Minister can only be pleased that the circumstances were such that that was one of the few more successful battles that we were able to fight against this Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the concern that is being felt throughout the beef industry at this moment by this same Minister should not go by too lightly by members opposite and the First Minister. We know that the Minister wants to move with or without the co-operation and the advice of the cattlemen and the beefmen in this province, that he wants to move in a very firm way in promoting his concept of marketing on the cattle producers in this province. We have seen the first steps of that initial inquiry that was made in the meat industry, the naming of the new task force, now to come in with specific recommendations. I only ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can you expect any degree of objectivity from this task force when the authors, the people that wrote the first initial inquiry, are now to examine their own report.

I can assure the Minister, Mr. Speaker, through you that the cattlemen, despite the generosity of this Minister, despite the millions of dollars that this Minister is prepared to use of the public purse to soften up the cattlemen to make them more amenable to his design --(Interjection)-- Well, I will tell you if the cattlemen of this country over the years required dollars alone to save their lives we would have stopped having the privilege of having beef on our tables a long time ago. Cattlemen have suffered through droughts, have suffered through cycles of bad markets, have suffered through disease, have suffered through many things prior to the event of this great saviour, the Minister of Agriculture, coming to save their respective and collective lives. Mr. Speaker, there is only one danger facing the cattle industry; there's only one danger facing the cattle

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont 'd) industry and that is the kind of involvement, that is the kind of lifesaving suffocating embrace that the Minister wants to put on the cattle industry and you will see that industry die. You will see that industry die as we are in the process of perhaps watching the vegetable industry die in this province.

Mr. Speaker, suffice to say that at least we have that satisfaction of knowing - those of us who represent the major rural portion of Manitoba and who are home in our constituencies - that despite this massive effort on the part of this government and this Minister in terms of actual dollars, the results that he is seeking as we move towards an election year have to be considered by him and by his colleagues one of the more dismal failures that this government has to accept.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell for a moment if I can on a theme that has been with this government since their inception which has grown stronger as the years went by and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, came to their fullest fruition during the course of this session. Mr. Speaker, this session has not been noted for a particularly stormy one or a controversial one - that is up until last night. We have had a reasonably good working session I would like to think. We've done what the opposition is supposed to do, examine the Estimates. We've examined their legislation. With much of it we've agreed and we've voted for it. In those areas where we showed our disagreement we attempted to show it as vigorously as we could and vote against it.

But, Mr. Speaker, a question that kept rising to the surface during this session is the question of basic human rights, and some pretty important rights. Mr. Speaker, this didn't just come to us this session. As I indicated it's been a concern in many Manitobans' minds and certainly most of our minds in the opposition from Day One. Mr. Speaker, it was one of the responsibilities and achievements of the opposition to, throughout the sessions, constantly be aware of what we call "snooper clauses" in their bills. We forever had to be worrying about cleaning up their Acts with respect to rights. Just the other day the government in their wisdom did accept major amendments from the Member for River Heights in this same area. Mr. Speaker, it was our constant vigilance that we had to keep with respect to preserving rights in the legislation that they brought forward on a wide range of matters.

Mr. Speaker, the question of rights seemed to surface more clearly during the course of this session in a number of bills. For some the question of rights wasn't that clear on Bill 56 for instance, the Art Exhibit Bill, and that's a matter of personal judgment. But, Mr. Speaker, they became much clearer in some of the bills that we just finished dealing with in committee. The Labour Relations Act. Such basic questions as freedom of speech surfaced in that particular Act. Such basic questions for some people, Mr. Speaker, as freedom of religion surfaced in that Act. Such basic freedoms as freedoms of assembly to some extent surfaced in that Act. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that for the more concerned members of that side they must have begun to realize that when put into a total package that as yet all that not clearly defined concern that is growing in a number of Manitobans, is in fact there, that for some reason or other for different people at different times, different reasons, a growing number of Manitobans are seriously concerned about how this matter, how this government treats their rights.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a long time, it hasn't happened in my memory that a religious order of church felt compelled, at their expense, to plead with the government in public for consideration of what they felt was a basic right respecting their faith. Mr. Chairman, the honourable members can ignore it but they ignore it at their peril because that question in my judgment will supersede in the long run the dollars and cents questions that I know are important, the big budget or the big spending of this government which I know is important, and will in many individual instances prove to be the deciding point for the elector. But when the elector gets uneasy in the pit of his stomach about his basic rights I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this government ought to recognize the difficulty that they're in.

A MEMBER: We're going to turf them out.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this government has done not badly when it comes to the concern and the protection of human rights in the private sector. Oh we're pretty fast, we're pretty fast and we acknowledge this government has, after all, introduced

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont'd) The Human Rights Act into this province. This government is concerned about the basic human rights of an employer, for instance, and employee relationship. This government has expressed and does correctly express concern about where human rights are perhaps ignored or trampled on in such areas of employment or housing. But, Mr. Speaker, where the government has shown a very strange silence and where they have shown a tremendous amount of callousness is in the rights that are trampled upon by government, by the public sector.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer briefly to a Judgment that was recently handed down in our courts and read to you what in my judgment should be a concern of all of us, a growing concern of all of us. I wish to read just one paragraph of a Judgment that was handed down by Judge Solomon, I believe. The learned trial judge put the matter eloquently when he said:

"There are many government-sanctioned boards in existence now having exclusive jurisdictions to administer many facets of the economic life of our country and as our life becomes more inter-dependent we will have even more such boards. These governmental boards are established to administer exclusively the many different economic programs in our society. They are established with noble aims and for noble purposes. Glaring abuse of power should not be allowed to pass without some assessment of it and indeed damages against it."

That's a statement of fact that I think is becoming more and more important in our society today, as the judge points out. Mr. Speaker, this case is not new, it was well publicized. But I wonder, I'd like the Member for Thompson to listen to how his board, his government is prepared to sit silently by when individual rights are being given a working over, you might say. I read just a portion of the judgment. The case involved the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Board which went out of its way, which went out of its way to persecute and discriminate against a particular family.--(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm well aware of where the situation is. It is not . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: (Premier) (Rossmere): On a point of order, Sir. I would like to raise the point of order that the Honourable Member for Lakeside should be given the opportunity to reflect as to whether or not the case he is citing is one which may be still subjudice in the sense that it may be under appeal to the Supreme Court or it may be still contemplated to be appealed and would he wish to infringe upon our long standing rule in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Our rule provides that if it is sub-judice then it is not possible to debate in this Chamber. There is no indication yet, and the First Minister knows that, no indication yet and until an appeal is filed that debate will take place in this House, because there is no provision on our rule that denies that debate from taking place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker. That is perhaps a relevant point. On the other hand, Sir, speaking to the point of order, I am quite prepared to show correspondence on file from a learned judge to the effect that he felt in his opinion it was improper for an honourable member to comment on a case, the appeal time for which had not yet lapsed.

BILL 79 (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Order please. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside will use discretionary and judicious thought in what he's going to say. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of the area that I'm entering into here but it will become very apparent that there is special reason for me to do so. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, again it has to be less than encouraging to hear the Attorney-General, who knows of the case, slough his hands off it by saying it's not a

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont'd) government board. I remind him that the board functions and operates under the Manitoba Marketing Board appointed entirely by this government as a supervisory body of all marketing boards in the Province of Manitoba. Indeed representatives of the Manitoba Marketing Board, not the Vegetable Marketing Board, were cited in this Judgment as being part and parcel of the action. Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to enter into debate about the subject matter but I want to appeal to the chief law officer of this province that surely silence, continued silence on his part, is unforgivable when you read the Judgment.

What the Defendant board did, what the Vegetable Board did was, to use a colloquial expression, "black list" the Gershman family. In my opinion its action in black listing the Gershman family was illegal and quite beyond the scope of its authority. The learned trial judge made findings of fact which clearly showed that the board did not act in good faith. He said as the hearings progressed and the evidence disclosed more and more acts of vindictiveness by the board against the Plaintiff, "I found it difficult to believe that this drama was acted out in 1974 in Manitoba and not from the pages of medieval history. Never, never in all my 16 years of public life and 18 years on the Bench have I come across a more flagrant abuse of power." In order to demonstrate to Plaintiff that his disagreements would not be tolerated, the board maliciously, with vindictiveness and under pretence that such actions were done to discharge the trust it owed the producers, harassed Plaintiff until it drove him out of the wholesale fruit and vegetable business.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for me rising on this subject matter at this time, because it is the last time I can, is that having come to that Judgment - and let me remind the Attorney-General a learned trial judge came to that Judgment initially - it was appealed. It was appealed, it went to the appeal court. Five learned judges in a unanimous verdict upheld the verdict. It has already cost the vegetable growers or producers some \$40,000 or \$50,000: \$35,000 in Settlement of Claim of court costs. The contemplation that further money should be expended to take this matter to the Supreme Court has to be viewed with the utmost of cynicism. Surely if a unanimous verdict of this kind, the harshness of the verdict of this kind, and that's not a concern to the Attorney-General. A family's individual rights are not a concern to this government.

But I want to tell you something. This, coupled with all the other rights that are being trampled on bit by bit in different places - you know, Mr. Speaker, the funny thing about rights, nobody is really too concerned about it until one's own toes are trampled on. It is the same way that this government's economic policies have by and large not had the same impact on the broader community until the accumulative effect of having pushed this little sector, having pushed that little sector, having confiscated that little sector - it has taken time. It has taken these seven years for the cumulated effect to begin to prevail and establish a mood, a mood of concern, a mood of fear, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of a growing number of majority. Mr. Speaker, I suggest what has this government done? What has the Minister of Agriculture done? What has the Minister of Agriculture who has appointed a board that five learned judges say has acted in a malicious and a vindictive way to drive one private family out of business, where is there some outcry for human rights, for civil rights? We're supposed to pass legislation in this Chamber knowing that these kinds of actions are tolerated by you gentlemen opposite, to pass all kinds of legislation that has within itself - at least in their hands - the kind of tools that you have too clearly indicated you're prepared to abuse. Has this government, has this Minister, has the First Minister taken any disciplinary action with respect to the Vegetable Marketing Board? Have you made a suggestion? Have you made a suggestion to them . . . Well here we go.

We appoint a supervisory board that supervises their actions, the Manitoba Marketing Board, and they are your appointees. They are your appointees. The responsibility of the Manitoba Marketing Board is to supervise the affairs of all marketing boards in this province. Their powers are legislated here in this Legislative Assembly. On this subject matter the Attorney-General speaks of, let me remind him, and he should be reminded of it, these boards that he is now speaking of, the producers never were given the opportunity to vote on them. I disbanded the better part of the Vegetable Board

BILL 79

(MR. ENNS cont'd) if you will recall back in 1966 and this Minister has put it back together again without the availability, without giving the producers the opportunity to avail themselves of a vote. And that is a fact. But, Mr. Speaker, I am happy. Let the government argue with me.

They don't see in this kind of a document any concern for rights. They aren't concerned when the judges liken their actions to Duplessis in Quebec in 1959. It is your government that is responsible for this kind of action. You don't mind when it comes to basic rights being likened or named in that company. Mr. Speaker, that's fair enough with me. But I can indicate to the First Minister and to the Attorney-General that it isn't fair enough with a growing number of Manitobans and what will be, without a doubt the majority of Manitobans come the next election.

The subject matter of rights has kind of a feeling that sometimes may be hard to define in precise terms but once there and once felt it's pretty hard to erase, pretty hard to erase with any glib propaganda; pretty hard to erase with any catchy slogans; pretty hard to erase with any Santa Claus budgets. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Manitobans simply won't stand for the kind of curtailment of rights that is creeping into ever increasing legislation by this government. The total lack of concern that this government has and displays right now when human rights and basic rights are trampled on by government is the best indicator yet of the mental attitude that this government has. You see this government, Mr. Speaker, doesn't think it's possible for the state to trample on individual rights. The private sector can do it and does it every day and they are charged with it every day. But, the state doing something in the name of the state, it's simply not possible in their convoluted thinking. In their concept, the state cannot be held responsible for any taking away of rights, can do no wrong because they bow to the motherhood and to the altar of the state. To them of course this whole concept is rather foreign and alien.

Mr. Speaker, this government is alienating itself from Manitobans every day because its positions on matters such as this are alien and foreign to most Manitobans.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Honourable First Minister, I'd like to indicate we have 33 students, Grade 5 standing of the Winnipeg Beach School up in the gallery, under the direction of Mr. Moore. This school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this morning.

BILL 79 (Cont'd)

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I find that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is always good in this Chamber for raising from time to time some of the more fundamental basic issues which face a democratic society and a democratic parliament. That is not to say, Sir, that I accept everything he says when he gets into his flight of philosophical discourse but I take everything that he says as being completely, genuinely meant. That is not to say that he is always being mischievous but it does mean that he is being mischievous a good part of the time and today was no exception.

The kind of context in which he put the current litigation and controversy with respect to the enforcement of certain regulations under the vegetable marketing program or policy and Vegetable Marketing Act really is, the way he put it, stating less than half of the total cases at issue. Of course who is going to deny, Sir, for a split second but that in any democratic society there is always, has always been, is now and always will be unavoidable tension or weighing off, balancing off as between individual rights and liberties on the one hand and on the other the extent to which there is need for positive action, programs and laws to protect the general public good.

What's new about that Sir? That was something which parliamentarians of the 18th century debated often with great passion, and it is being debated now from time to time with great passion and I have no doubt whatsoever but that a century from now, if

BILL 79

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) the planet survives, this will still be at issue. That's why political society is divided into basically two kinds of politicians reflecting two basic differing views of how a democratic society should be operating. The one is essentially a conservative view and the other is essentially a social democratic or - liberal view, properly understood.

My honourable friends want to pretend that we are doing something here which is an infringement on individual rights in a way that would not be countenanced by let us say Conservative Governments. I point to the Province of Ontario and ask them to find out for themselves how many marketing boards with regulations very similar to ours are in place in the Province of Ontario. Would I be wrong if I were to say that indeed there are if anything more than here in the Province of Manitoba.

The second point I would make, Sir, is that one needn't even go to the Province of Ontario but could look right here in our own venue in the Province of Manitoba and find that some ten years ago and more, when a former Minister of Agriculture in the then Conservative Government was the Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable George Hutton, that his philosophic approach to agricultural commodity marketing wasn't really much different than that which is typified by our present Minister of Agriculture or myself. Where the big difference rises is not as between the Conservative or Social Democratic approach but rather as between different Conservatives it would seem. Let them not pretend that for the most part the regulations that apply with respect to vegetable marketing in this province, if not totally at least in large part, were promulgated back in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1964. Well now, where possibly is the genuineness of their indignation, given that a good part of what is involved here was established by regulatory procedures laid down under the authorship of the Honourable George Hutton back in 1964 --(Interjection)-- My honourable friends follow what I call the politics of convenience. The politics of convenience today is to roll with what they believe to be the prevailing attitude, growing prevailing attitude of somewhat of a reaction towards the instrumentality of the state being used by people. In other words, to put it bluntly, there is a bit of a tide of conservative negativism growing in this country and in the continent. They're trying to cash in on it and of course that's the name of the game. I don't blame them one iota. I just continue to believe, Sir - and I must confess that my belief is tinged with some element of hope that more rational forces will prevail if not in 1976 then in 1977 or 1978 - but certainly that this so-called tide will reverse itself because I regard that tide, which I admit exists to some degree in this year and in last year, is sort of the very antithesis of what I believe a decent civilized society should be trending towards. Lest that remark be thought of as being somehow the remarks of a hopeless idealist or radical I want to just take this opportunity to quote from a speech that is four days old. It was made on Commonwealth Day and it is as follows:

"We believe that the wide disparities in wealth now existing are too great to be tolerated. They also create world tensions" - and what applies on a world scale, Sir, can certainly apply by extension to any local society. That is an observation that I add. "Our aim is the progressive removal of these disparities. We therefore seek to use our efforts to overcome poverty, ignorance, disease, in raising standards of life and achieving a more equitable society." And it goes on, and it's signed Elizabeth R.

Honourable friends will probably find some reason for saying that that should be put aside as being merely intended for nice platitude window-dressing, although I don't believe that that's why it was issued.

Now I want to quote from the symposium that has been going on for the past, I don't know a week or ten days, in Vancouver under the auspices of the United Nations, hosted by Canada with great pride and I suppose rightly so, Habitat. A statement was issued by the Habitat Conference to this effect: "The issue is all the more urgent that with the increasing possibility of the earth's resources not being adequate to provide developed levels of income for all, large concentrations of personal wealth will more and more imply absolute deprivation in other parts of the human community."

How in the world, Mr. Speaker, can there be this hypocritical pretence carrying on so long that we can practice a conservation ethic? Everybody agrees that we must

BILL 79

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) begin to practice more of a conservation ethic but, Sir, implicit in any conservation ethic is the necessity that those who are consuming more in per capita terms must somehow accept the premise that they should consume less. If it doesn't mean that, what does the conservation ethic mean? By its very definition "wealth" is a means, wealth or money - to put it in the more specific sense - is a means by which resources can be commanded. What is the purpose of wealth if it is not to command resources for consumption? Therefore any conservation ethic that is to be worthy of the name and non-hypocritical must inevitably result in the final analysis in the willingness of those who have the means by which to command resources to be commanding less of them, consuming less of them. But if that happens, Sir, then that is, of course, a horrendous step towards more equality of the human condition, towards a more egalitarian society which is what they are resolutely opposed to. So you see, Sir, there is a very clear conundrum in terms of the ultimate conservative position and where it leads you to in the final analysis. It leads you to a big fat zip in terms of reconciliation with morality and ultimate objectives of any human decent civilized society. But I don't want to wax philosophical. My honourable friend from Lakeside has only prompted this because of his propensity to become philosophical.

I want to deal with some of the specifics, something far more tangible and closer to home. He left the impression on Hansard this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education had been successfully pilloried because of this government's failure with respect to school finance, education finance. In that regard very quickly I want to make two observations.

The first is that I have here just a couple of letters which typify the attitude of a good many school divisions in this province and I will read these two letters. They are both to the Minister of Education and it reads as follows:

"The Board of Trustees of this school division wishes to congratulate you on the recent grant announcements that recognize the higher costs in lower assessed areas. This board appreciates being able to present a budget to the Municipal Council of the Town of The Pas and the Local Government District of Consol that does not reflect an increase without appreciably having to alter the programs offered.

"Thanking you on behalf of the Board for your consideration, Yours truly,
Secretary-Treasurer, Delsey School Division No. 45."

So there, Sir, is an indication that a town which was in rather desperate financial circumstance and the school division with it, we have managed by means of - may I be permitted immodesty - intelligent modification of the grant structure to turn the situation around. And this letter is documentary proof of that.

Then here - this will be more to the interest of the Honourable the Member for Pembina - we have a letter to the Minister of Education which among other things says as follows: "The Division Board would urge you to continue your present policy of increased grants to school divisions by way of the equalization per pupil grant rather than increased teachers salary grants." That's signed by the Secretary-Treasurer, Garden Valley School Division, Winkler, Manitoba.

So there we have it, Sir, from the north to the extreme south of the province letters more or less to the same effect. If my honourable friends think that with respect to the generality that we are somehow being stingy or parsimonious with school education financing, I want to say that of course while there is room for quibbling or being picayune about the very specific percentages or dollars involved, the fact of the matter is that the proportion of total public elementary and secondary school costs in this province that is borne by the province as a percentage of the total, is substantially greater than it was at any time in the past.

I rather suspect that the reason that there may be an opportunity here to work some political mischief at the grass roots is because we have not quite maintained their level of financial support to schools, I have to admit, at the 1973 level. But certainly it is higher, Sir, than in 1972, '71, '70, '69, '68, '67, '66. So what have they got to complain about? We are putting in a higher proportion of financing, the financing or cost load of education in this province than in the past decade and somehow we are getting pilloried for it. I think it is because our Minister of Education is just too fine a

BILL 79

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) gentleman. If I were the Minister of Education I would retaliate in kind and believe me there is a lot of kind in which and with which to retaliate.

The figures speak for themselves. The percentage of financial support by the Provincial Government in the decade of the '60s never went beyond 50 percent, certainly never went beyond 55 percent. It is substantially higher than that today, without exaggerating the point at least 15 percentage points higher. One could even make the argument it is 20 percentage points higher, but it is not less than 15 percentage points higher that much is certain.

So how in the Sam Hill can this kind of errant nonsense be talked about with such persistence? I suppose I have to admit with some reluctance, with some evidence of a degree of plausibility, the fact remains --(Interjection)-- Well I know it's no problem for the Member for Roblin because I say to him very bluntly that he is a member who in my 18 years in public office I have seldom seen, in terms of complete contempt for the truth which he typifies. I've said that before, I make no bones about it.

I happened to see a letter which he wrote to a local newspaper in 1973, and, Sir, I have never seen the likes in my life. That letter which he wrote to the Roblin newspaper, I think it was in May of 1973, Sir, I have never seen anything like it in terms of the utter disrespect, utter disregard, complete contempt for propriety, ethics, integrity in stating the facts, etc., etc., etc. --(Interjection)--

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that on education financing there is a substantial difference. The proportion that has been put in by the province in 1969, for example, was 50 percent of the total bill of \$149 million. In 1975 the provincial input was in the order of 70 - and one has an area of argumentation here so I put it as a range - between 70 and 75 percent of the total cost of education which was no longer \$149 million but in the order of \$291 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside also made mention with respect to government spending in general - it is a completely valid observation for him to make, I have no quarrel with it - it is indeed incumbent upon us to always maintain close scrutiny as to the extent to which our spending on public programs and services is changing and the extent to which it is changing at a rate faster than our own revenues, our own revenue potential and in relation to other jurisdictions in our nation, in our country. And while it is repetitious on my part I admit, it is no more wrong for me to be repetitious, Sir, than it is for the Honourable Member for Lakeside. So each time he or any of his colleagues keep coming back to the question of government spending, intimating that it is somehow out of line, I must simply repeat with them the counter argument that expenditures by the Crown in the right of the province in Manitoba are not out of line at all in comparison to other provinces in Canada. That surely is a valid observation.

Indeed the essential point to realize here, Sir, is that among the ten provinces in Canada, Manitoba's per capita expenditures as the Crown in the right of the province, have not changed from the same relative position among the ten provinces as was the case ten years ago or 20 years ago. The last time I had opportunity to check this, about six to eight months ago, certainly Manitoba's relative position in spending per capita was the same in the year 1975 as it was in 1965, as I believe it was in 1955. Because in the dynamics of public sector and public financing there has been a proportionate increase among the other provinces in Canada.

Now then the Honourable Member for Lakeside mentions lotteries. I don't know what I can say to my honourable friend except that I share about the same enthusiasm for lotteries as he does. To be fair I should acknowledge the fact that I believe he did not support the introduction of lotteries and that fact should be noted as a matter of fact. I believe I spoke for a grand total of five to ten minutes at the time of the introduction of the lottery legislation in 1970 or late 1969 and at that time indicated that I rather felt and hoped that this would relate to our centennial year and that subsequent to that if it continued it would be continued on a low-key basis. Well I must admit that it hasn't happened that way.

BILL 79

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

I should make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the revenues of the province, the Consolidated Revenues of the province do not take lottery revenues in for use by the departments of the government. The revenues generated by the lotteries go towards the sellers and to the - I guess you could say the private, volunteer, non-profit community organizations and other organizations now such as the Legion and the United Way and the Sports Federation and the Arts Council.

I feel uneasy about the way in which lotteries have become, in a way, big money. But then again here too, Sir, if you look across the country you will find that lotteries have been introduced in other jurisdictions. Some of them have federated as among the provinces. The problems of keeping lotteries above board, I suppose, will be always present. We have had problems here; the Province of Ontario has had prosecutions in its jurisdiction with respect to abuse and unethical practices under lotteries. So all we can do, Sir, is to maintain a vigilance with respect to lottery operations, but let it be understood that if we did not have lotteries here there would simply be the exportation of moneys that would be wagered by Manitobans to buy lotteries in other jurisdictions, even across the ocean such as in Ireland, indeed that was the case for many years, so that this is not such a pure black and white simple problem to cope with.

In the final analysis, Sir, the sums of money that are involved in Bill 79 are simply and frankly amounts which in per capita terms put Manitoba in as responsible a position as any other province in Canada in terms of trying to meet the wide spectrum of need and desire for service as any of our fellow Canadians anywhere else in Canada.
QUESTION put MOTION carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to indicate that we have 72 students from the Harold Hatcher School of Grade 4 and 5 standing under the direction of Mrs. O'Brian. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

We welcome you this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, we wish to move to Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that you, Sir, leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 69, 87 and 79.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of grievance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're going into Committee of the Whole, not into Supply, that procedure does not apply at this time.

QUESTION put MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 69. Could we just wait a minute until the Legislative Counsel arrives. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, as you and honourable members will recall, Bill 69 was dealt with in committee stage the day before yesterday and we held over the bill because of certain sections only, so it's a case of dealing with those sections.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the amendment here but I think we need some more copies of it. And I wonder if there are more available somewhere.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm sorry?

MR. CRAIK: Do you have extra copies of the amendment there for Bill 69?

BILL 69

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, included in the two pages that have been circulated, the first amendment relates to subsection 68, and it has to do with the observations that were made in the past couple of weeks in discussion of this bill with respect to the fact that the formula we are seeking to modify does contain inherent in it the potential for anomaly in that in those years in which special sessions take place, the inclusion of the Special Sessional Indemnity would swell the base upon which the calculation of pension eligibility takes place.

So then, as I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition pointed out, to some extent different members of the Assembly are really subject to the luck of the draw, so to speak; by that I mean if in one seven-year period there may be no special session or one, and in another seven-year period in the past had about four or five special sessions.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition pointed out in a way that certainly I could not disagree with that there must be a way to put this on a more rational plane and accordingly certain amendments are proposed here. The first amendment really has to do with bringing the period for averaging of the base upon which the pension is calculated from the basis of seven years to one of the last five years. I might add this certainly brings it into line with the majority of provinces in terms of their provision in this regard. One province still has seven-year averaging, most have five and three provinces have three-year averaging. I don't know that there is any overwhelming argument to use as between seven, five or three, except that five would seem to us to be perhaps in the nature of a middling compromise. It's as good as any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Craik. I beg the honourable member's pardon, I did not mean to address you by name. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: This particular Section 8(1) as the First Minister has mentioned averaging out to five rather than to seven, at the present time would likely have the effect of raising the values of the pension if there were not a special session occurred in that period of seven years that was used in the average period. So by later on removing in later stages in the amendment here where the special sessions cannot affect the seven-year averaging period, using the five probably statistically offsets it; whether it's an increase or not would depend on whether or not a special session happened to be called late in the seven-year averaging period. So it would seem most likely that this will have the effect of raising it but only in the event that, well most likely anyway, only in the event that there didn't happen to be a special session late in a period when the seven-year averaging was used.

So, Mr. Chairman, the only other questions I have are with reference to I think Section 68(1.1) and I'll wait till we get there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could have someone move the amendment.

MR. SCHREYER: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is all right under the rules if I move this amendment, and accordingly I would move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Bill 69 be amended by adding thereto immediately after Section 8 thereof, the following sections: Section 8.1 Subsection 68(1) of the Act is amended by striking out the figure "7" where it appears in the 5th line thereof, in the 6th line thereof, and in the second line of clause (a) thereof, and substituting therefor, in each case the figure "5".

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion before the committee is one moved by the Honourable First Minister. Deal with it clause by clause - 8.1--pass; 8.2 subsection 68(1.1)(a)--pass;

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should move this, should I not, strictly speaking. And accordingly I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs, that Bill 69 be amended by adding thereto after Section 8 the following:

After 8.1, 8.2 subsection 68 of the Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after subsection (1) the following subsections:

68(1.1) for the purposes of calculating an annual allowance under subsection (1) and of determining the number of years a person has served as a member;

(a) any indemnity paid for a special session of the Legislature shall not be included in calculating the average annual indemnity paid to a member in any year;

BILL 69

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

(b) the years in respect to which a member paid contributions shall be increased in respect of each special session which the member attended by a portion of a year calculated in accordance with the following formula: (And then the following goes on to give definition, if I may take that as read)

$$Y = \frac{A}{I}$$

In this formula

Y is the portion of a year to be added in accordance with this subsection in respect of a special session to the years in respect of which the member made contributions:

A is the indemnity paid to the member for the special session; and

I is the statutory indemnity for which provision was made at the time of the special session.

Definitions for subsection (1.2).

68(1.2) In subsection (1.1)

(a) "special session" means a session of the Legislature for which the members were paid indemnities less than the statutory indemnities for which provision was made at the time of that session;

(b) "statutory indemnity" means the indemnity payable to a member for a regular session of the Legislature and for which provision was made under this Act or any Act for which this Act was substituted.

Existing pensioners not to have a reduced pension.

68 (1.3) Where, on the coming into force of this subsection, a person was receiving an annual allowance under this Part, the annual allowance shall not be reduced by reason of any recalculation of the annual allowance in accordance with subsections (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed (Agreed). The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: In (b) of 68, (1.1)(b) it indicates here that the years in respect of which a member paid contributions shall be increased in respect of each special session which the member attended by a portion of the year calculated in accordance with the following formula.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask one question here. Specifically now, a special session that would have occurred in 1969 which was approximately seven-tenths of a session in terms of the measured indemnity if you took the special indemnity compared to the normal indemnity. It works out to 51 over 72, which is roughly 70 percent of the normal indemnity. Adding that on to the years of service since the 1969 election then, would I gather as of June 25th this year '76 means that a person who was elected in '69 would have an accumulated service at that point of 7.7 years? So, Mr. Chairman, my question then is: When would the eight-year vesting time limit be reached?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the main purpose of this amendment is I believe agreed to in substance by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and really it has to do with how to treat the calculated value for superannuation of a special session, in that on the one hand to treat a short special session as being the value of a year isn't really equitable. This formula would treat it on a basis of nothing more than what is the actual ratio of indemnity to the indemnity of a full regular session. So it's completely proportionalized as opposed to either ignoring it completely or counting it as though it were a full session, either of two I would have to regard as being excessive or extreme, either extreme in a negative sense or extreme in the opposite sense.

Now I gather that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition isn't questioning that but rather the impact that this has in terms of impacting on the eight-year vesting requirement or entitlement --(Interjection)-- The answer to that very roughly, I believe, the one special session of the autumn of 1969 on the basis of this formula would move the entitlement up by five-sevenths of a year, so that would mean therefore November or December instead of June.

BILL 69

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: I wasn't in any way questioning the principle involved in what was being done, I just wanted to have the clarification before the House winds up that - I know it would never be a consideration, but if by chance an election were called roughly October 25th of this year, those who were elected in 1969 would be vested.

MR. SCHREYER: I thought perhaps that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was taking advantage of this opportunity to advance some suggestions, but I can advise him that this formula in this context is academic because I can tell him this much that it was never contemplated to have an election in October 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 68(1.1)(a)--pass; (b)--pass; Formula--pass. 68.1(1.1)--pass. The Honourable First Minister . . . you didn't read the whole thing and you said it's going to be accepted as read. Is it agreeable that we proceed then with 68(1.2)(a) and (b) and 68(1.3) as read? Okay then.

68(1.2)(a)--pass; (b)--pass; 68(1.2)--pass; 68(1.3)--pass; 8.2--pass;
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: There are two amendments still. One is having to do with the coming into effect section, which is the last section of the bill and the other has to do with, I am advised, technical corrections, which has just been distributed to honourable members, and I would require leave that Section 5 of the bill be allowed to be amended in accordance with the motion which has been distributed. I'm advised by the Legislative Counsel that this amendment is necessary in order to correct technical inaccuracies in the existing section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister have leave? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister move the amendment then please.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism that section 5 of Bill 69 be amended by striking out the figure "61(3)" in the 1st line thereof and substituting therefor the figure "60(1)(b) by striking out the word "and" where it appears for the first time in the 2nd line thereof, then again in the 3rd line thereof" and (c) by striking out the figure and letters "1st" in the 2nd line thereof and substituting therefor the figures and letters "2nd".

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, lastly with respect to the last section of the bill, Section 14 I have a motion which has been distributed, so I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Highways that Section 14 of Bill 69, as previously amended be further amended by adding thereto, at the end thereof, the words and figures "and section 1 is retroactive and shall be deemed to have been in force on, from and after July 1, 1975".

MOTION as moved. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this section of the bill was the one section that we did take exception to and that's section 1, which will allow for members of the Legislature to avail themselves of certain government programs and benefits if that person doesn't exceed a total of one percent of the total number of persons benefiting and so on. We indicated our displeasure at having the Act changed to broaden it out to allow this sort of a grey zone of interpretation and so we would, Mr. Chairman, also oppose the principle of having it made retroactive since we, in the first place of course do not support the general principle of this action taking place whether it's after July 1, 1975 or after July 1, 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I could only add that we are not completely certain that our attempt to clarify the Legislative Assembly Act with respect to the matter of section 19, which has always been, we feel, a bit of a grey zone, we're not certain that our proposed change here will ultimately prove to be all that more clarifying.

BILL 69

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) In that event it is always open to subsequent legislatures to make further refinements in the law. In the meantime, having passed the amendment to subsection 19 of the Act we feel that this section of enactment as of July 1, 1975 does also clarify certain ambiguities with respect to the cow-calf program eligibility and the flood assistance, so that's why I propose it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: MOTION--pass? --(Interjection)-- the amendment. Yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: I would suggest we call it on division then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass on division. Preamble--pass; Title--pass; Bill be reported.

BILL NO. 87 - THE STATUE LAW AMENDMENT (FINANCE) ACT

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, fortunately there is no great surfeit of paper that should confuse us on this bill. This bill was dealt with in committee the day before yesterday and all sections dealt with with the exception of this one page which we agreed we would circulate and honourable members would have an opportunity to digest the implications of the proposed amendments, and I'm hoping that in moving it today that honourable members will be able to respond, hopefully favourably, to this proposed amendment.

If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes me to re-explain what the intent is I would be pleased to do so but otherwise I would merely move the motion, if I may, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs that Bill 87 be amended on the basis as distributed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the intent of the bill was explained the other day, day before yesterday, by the First Minister, in that the basic principle would attempt at least to put a limit on the commissions or discounts that are levied by people who are in the business of discounting income tax returns, and we asked at that time that it be held over until this committee stage for us to have a look at it and caucus it.

We agree in principle with the bill, we raise some question as to the enforceability of it, however, we don't disagree with the concept and trust that it will bring about some beneficial effects in this particular business that's been going on and in which there are serious complaints coming in from people that are affected in an undesirable way, perhaps not by the majority of the people who are in the business but by at least some of the people who tend to fall into a trap of being victimized in the business. The only further comment I can say is that it's worth the attempt to attempt to bring a degree of regulation to this business and trust the government will find some success over the next year or so and then can review it if other action is necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 58.1(1)--pass; 58.1(2)--pass; 15.1 in its entirety--pass; Preamble--pass.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, just to be completely certain, I believe that there has to be a further amendment and that is consequential to the fact that this amendment has just been approved. That means that in the last section of the bill which has to do with the date of coming into effect that there now has to be an amendment that provides for this section just passed to come into force on a date fixed by proclamation. And if that is agreed to I will move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Bill 87 be amended by adding thereto, immediately after the word "Act" in the 1st line of renumbered subsection (1) thereof, the words and figures "except section 15.1, and then that section 15.1 of the Act come into force on a day fixed by proclamation.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble--pass; Title--pass. Bill be reported.

BILL 79 - GRANTING OF FISCAL MONEYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 79, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1977. Is it the will of the Committee to deal with it page by page?

Pages 1 to 14, Preamble and Title were read and passed. Bill be reported.

That completes the work of the Committee of the Whole. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bills 69, 87 and has adopted certain amendments, and Bill 79 without any amendments, directs me to report same and asks leave to meet again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - THIRD READING

Bill Nos. 69 and 87 were read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 79 - GRANTING OF FISCAL MONEYS

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 79, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1977 for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on Bill 79, the Supply Bill, at this third and final reading. Mr. Speaker, we've had some debate this morning on some issue that I think have been well brought out, which are very current, very topical as far as the present attitude and direction and, if I can use the word "trending", that was used by the First Minister with regard to the affairs of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the issue that took place this morning regarding the infringement on individual right by the Crown that was mentioned by the Member for Lakeside points out the particular problems that arise as government becomes more and more involved in all sectors of the life of the people of our province. We've seen in this particular session moves taken by the government to control the rights of people. They've done it in a manner which, if you look at the legislation, has been an approach that doesn't equally balance itself out in the effort by the government to protect human rights.

Mr. Speaker, we've passed legislation, Labour Relations Act, through the committee stages in which efforts have been made to provide and ensure more rights, more protection for people, a majority of the people that might fall into that particular category. We have at the same time seen an infringement and encroachment on the rights of a small minority in that group who don't constitute a large number of people but who wish to be left out of the infringement of government action on the exercise of their rights. But the majority that were legislated for in those bills, in the Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker, and in the Petty Trespassers Act, Court of Queen's Bench Act, the small things that the government is attempting to do there, to the favour of a very large majority of the number of people in that sector are concerned, is not evident in yet another act, Bill 20, which we dealt with last night.

I don't wish to speak specifically to the bills, Mr. Speaker, but on the one hand there is a move by the government to go into depth to acknowledge in the enshrinement of legislation the rights of someone wishing to carry a card, a sign, a picket, or some other matter that really isn't all that critical as far as when you compare it to the human rights of a person who wishes to carry on a particular endeavour that might fall in the category of being a business. Because, Mr. Speaker, we are in the process now of passing legislation that would allow a person who is in business to not have any rights at all, any rights in terms of taking action in a court against an action against him by the government. No rights, Mr. Speaker, as to any notification to him that action is going to be taken against him by the government; no notification to him, Mr. Speaker, that he has any right of appeal whatsoever; no recognition in it that he has any right to counsel. Mr. Speaker, we're doing that at the same time in an Act of this Legislature that we're bending over backwards in another sector to accommodate another group of people in our society, of course a group of people that far outnumber in real numbers the ones affected by the second set of legislation, and that contained in The Trade Practices Act in Bill 20.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government is the government of all the people. The government is the government that sets up the guidelines and establishes what the rules

BILL 79

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) of the game are. But when the government starts using the legislative procedure to go into depth to satisfy one particular sector of the community who comes to them and on the other hand establishes legislation that clearly will do very little else, other than allow another sector of the community to be used as a whipping boy, which is essentially the best that can be done out of Bill 20, everything that is asked for there can be done principally by the Anti-Inflation Board. This is permanent statute that is going on the books in written form. No indication of a termination date. Clear, unfettered powers, arbitrary powers to a Minister of the Crown to do anything to anybody at any time that he wishes to do. That is what is on the books, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 20. With no right of appeal, no necessary notification to him that it's going to happen, just complete and absolute arbitrary power to the Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfair, unbalanced democracy and unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, because we already have enough of it at the federal level to do the job if in fact the job can be done, either through the Anti-Inflation Board or through The Combines Act at the federal level. Mr. Speaker, we have more than an adequate supply of legislation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister have a point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I put the point of order forward more in the interrogative vein, merely to ask whether it is not clear under the rules and under practice that where the subject matter being referred to is clearly relating to that of a bill which is still to come forward for debate on third reading stage, whether it is really permissible under the rules and practice that the very substantive discussion take place on another bill, such as Bill 79 which is now before us. All the remarks of the past five to ten minutes relate to Bill 20, which is still to be called.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with the point of order raised by the First Minister and I don't intend to deal in depth any further with Bill 20. The point I am attempting to make is that on the supply bill, is that this is a bill that covers all the departments and all the activities of the government, the point I'm attempting to make is that the government is the government of all the people and not the government of one particular sector of the people. When they are going to deal with different sectors of the community, they must deal with them on an equal basis. They must make sure that the rights of an individual are going to be protected for all sectors of the community. We had an example this morning presented by the Member for Lakeside on a particular case where a party, an individual, was persecuted, very severely, by an agency of the Crown, an agency of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, who gained their power, and absolute power in one section of the marketplace because of the legislation passed by this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture state his point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Riel, the Leader of the Opposition, is indicating that the Vegetable Producers Marketing Board is an agency of the Crown. It is not an appointed body, it is an elected body, by the people who make up that Association.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, technically the Manitoba Marketing Board is established and appointed by the Crown, the Vegetable Marketing Board as the Minister has indicated is a . . . they're by election, but they report to the Manitoba Marketing Board. Mr. Speaker, what's more important is not the fact that they're appointed or elected in this particular case. The fact is that they operate under the absolute powers, powers, Mr. Speaker, in the marketplace granted to them by this legislation. They control absolutely the marketplace in the vegetable industry in the major categories of trade. There is no one else allowed in there. And in this particular case, we have an individual who was so penalized by that group in a vindictive action that his place of employment was threatened with being disallowed to operate if they continued to allow him to be employed. That is how bad it was.

Now all of that, Mr. Speaker, came under the good intentions of a government

BILL 79

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) to rationalize the vegetable industry. How many times have we heard that, "rationalize an industry." Mr. Speaker, we rationalized the fish industry, we rationalized the automobile insurance industry. All of these end up being more and more powers, but what is happening to the individual when he has to come to deal with these monopolies?

Mr. Speaker, we have one of the clearest and most alarming cases that's ever happened with regards to one person, who has fallen heir to having his occupation under the aegis of the marketing board on vegetables, and that's what's happened to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say again is that when the government brings in bills that don't provide an avenue for an individual, it may in most cases be even a corporation, a company, or an individual, it doesn't make any difference, they're all subject to the same provisions of a particular bill that we're facing in the House, and that one says that they have no rights, they do not have to be notified as to what is going to happen to them in their activities, they have no procedure by which they can necessarily appear to participate, they have no method of appeal, there's no provision, they are not allowed to go to the courts or to any other tribunal once a decision is handed down on them. And, Mr. Speaker, that is a denial that this government would not have seen fit to produce and show in some of its other legislation. I ask this government whether they would pass legislation that says for the purposes of the control of the present inflationary period we are in, that there will be no collective bargaining for the next three years. Would they pass that? Would they allow the denial of the due process of the bargaining table to all the workers of Manitoba, saying you will receive no notification, we'll pass judgment, you'll have no appeal; you'll have no right to any tribunal; you'll have no rights to the courts; Mr. Speaker, would they say that? You bet your boots they wouldn't say that, Mr. Speaker. They're not going to trample on those kind of votes, but they'll do it to another sector, and they'll do it fast. They'll subjugate another sector of our society to the complete and absolute and arbitrary control of the Minister without right of appeal, notification or anything else. They'll do it fast. And that's exactly what they're doing, that's a hallmark of this government, so busy playing politics with the majority that they are not recognizing the necessity of being the government of all people and treating all people fairly.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not finished with yet, and this is one of the things that emerges out of a debate when you have time to examine it, look at it, and have advice on it. Mr. Speaker, I would ask you how many major bills we've had in the last two weeks where that has not been possible.

Mr. Speaker, somebody on the government side is reported in the last couple of days in the paper, as saying, we're in no hurry, you can have all the time you like. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we probably would have been well advised a week ago to simply close the House down for an entire week, because faced with the number, half a dozen at least, of critical bills, it would take at least a week for the digestion process alone to take place. It's not so much a problem of just the members of the Legislature being able to read a bill and make a judgment as to whether they're for or against the bill; it's more a problem of having people, the population of Manitoba, becoming aware of the bill, time to think about it, digest it, feedback their feelings about the bill through the members of the Legislature, have them make their representation where representation is possible and then have it passed. I think probably there's many people that feel that that process is really a very cumbersome process, but what's failed to be recognized many times is that when legislation is passed and rules and regulations are enshrined in the written word, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for them to change. It's not difficult because it can't be done in this House, it's difficult because it just doesn't get done. It gets buried in the legislation, it gets buried in the bureaucracy, the powers get exercised by the bureaucracy, the feedback never comes back to the Chamber as to whether the regulations that are written, or the laws that we've passed have in fact been administered in a fair and equitable manner. So what we put into the legislation that emerges out of this House requires time, and it requires study. It has a far greater impact on the society of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba, than one recognizes when you

BILL 79

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) read a simple piece of paper. What you don't recognize in most cases is that that is going to be in force for a long time, it's going to affect a lot of people, and in the dying moments when you're rushing through mistakes are made. And they've been made before, in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and they've been debated before, the mistakes that have been made late in the session have been debated before.

I want to give the government fair notice, that if by chance we're still in the same relative positions a year from now, we will not pass the speed-up motion without a fight. And, Mr. Speaker, we this year, said we recognized the need for a speed-up motion because it came that time of session. We didn't recognize the number of bills and the importance of the bills and the size of the bills that we were going to have to deal with in the speed-up. I can recall when the present acting House Leader was on this side of the House and he fought the speed-up motion for weeks on end, Mr. Speaker. I could never figure out why. It's not until this year I found out, Mr. Speaker. I guarantee you that next year you're going to get . . . if, as I say, we still are in the same relative positions, you're going to get a fight on the speed-up motion, because we are not going to see democracy hustled along at this rate, Mr. Speaker. It isn't doing justice to the legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I want to say that we've now come to the end of a session, a session that started out being an attack on inflation by the government. I think that that was the primary objective of the government. I think that we've dealt with the bills and legislation that have been more important than what was anticipated at the beginning of the session; I think we're finishing the session with close to 100 bills, and many of them are very important bills, much more important in the way of controls that they are putting on our society, controls on people, than had been anticipated.

It's a session in which the government I don't think has made strides in the fight against inflation. It was started out that the government announced its budget to be an increase of 12 to 14 percent, in that range. But when one found that the shifts that had been taken place on municipal grants into the revenue column, and student aid grants back to Federal Government, and some of the other smaller shifts that were in the budget, it turns out to be a fairly normal size of increase compared to the year before and is probably closer to the 16 to 18 percent range which, Mr. Speaker, I don't think can be judged as being anti-inflationary.

There have been taxes increased which are natural in an inflationary time because many of the taxes are growth taxes. But there has in addition to that been new taxes imposed in the excess of \$40 million, which is the largest increase in new taxes that the government has brought in during its tenure of seven years. And although they've been billed as anti-inflationary taxes, I think, Mr. Speaker, that you'd find a lot of trouble finding many people that would agree that a new tax can be termed as an anti-inflationary move, but still we have \$40 million of new taxes. So, Mr. Speaker, those are all the comments I wish to pass on the bill at this time.

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

MR. PETE ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I intend to be very brief, in fact I was not intending to make any comments on the Supply Bill, and if the First Minister had commented on some of the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside I would probably have not spoken at this time. But I just simply could not allow some of the remarks that the honourable gentleman made to go unchallenged, and I want to refer specifically to his comments when he made reference to the, he labels the program, "Santa Claus" program.

I'm trying to be fair and say the words as he put them. I believe he mentioned "buying votes", "vote getting programs" and "Santa Claus" programs. He referred specifically to such programs as the beef assurance program, and he did comment that the livestock producers of this province did not need that kind of a program. That's what the honourable member was trying to infer when he mentioned that they had gone through floods and droughts, low prices, boom and bust cycles, and they had survived. I want to advise the honourable member in the House that the Member for Lakeside and the members on that side of the House have not been listening to the livestock producers

BILL 79

(MR. ADAM cont'd) in the last two years. They have had their ears closed, Mr. Speaker, they have not listened to the pleas and cries of succour from the livestock producers of this province - and there are some on that side.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside is a livestock producer himself, and I want to be fair to him that he is not one of those livestock producers - I try to isolate him now from being a representative of this Chamber - he is not one of those producers who've asked for this kind of a program, or a flood assistance program. And neither - I'll be fair to the Member for Gladstone who is also a livestock producer, I'm sure that he didn't ask for this program. But they have not been listening, Mr. Speaker, because in the last two or three years livestock producers at the primary level have been pleading for assistance and help to have some relief from the high cost of inputs and the low price of what they were receiving for their production. They were standing on the doorsteps of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the cow-calf operators, pleading to have the rates they were charged for their leases lowered because they could not afford to pay even the - what I consider to be not a high price for the use of land - but they were unable to pay those prices, for what they were receiving for their production, they were unable to absorb those high prices.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside I'm sure has benefitted by the fact that this government has removed the lease charge for '75 and '76. And the honourable member has approximately I understand 1,700 acres which in the last two years he has not had to pay for, and I don't know what he pays annually, but I'm sure it must have been at least four or \$5,000 of a saving.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order that undoubtedly will be ignored by the honourable member, but I do raise it as a matter of personal order, it seems to demonstrate this government's lack of individual rights right in this Chamber. I believe that the discussion of one's private affairs has not been germane in this Chamber. I have no objection to the member choosing to go into my operation as to the number of acres, the number of cattle, and when I have stopped beating my wife lately, but it is I suggest just another small invasion of a kind of a traditional rule that we've had in this Chamber that we do not discuss each other's personal affairs --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that was a point of order or not; if that was allowed, I think I should be allowed the latitude to point out that only a few moments ago there was discussion on another item which involved the expenditure of public funds, where the opposition suggested that there was something in their mind unethical about participating in government programs. The Member for Lakeside is indicating . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In respect to whether it's a point of order or not, I can concur that it is not. It is a matter of taste. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we're becoming accustomed to the way the Member for Lakeside gets up on a point of privilege or a point of order when the truth strikes home. And when we touch a nerve he has a habit of standing up, when it touches a nerve. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, now he says, touch him. He says touch him. I just touched him a while ago and he objected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me suggest that if we're going to raise the level of debate we stay on the impersonal side and it would be much better for all concerned. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that they had better wash their ears out, because they are not listening, they are not listening to those people out there where I come from. They are not listening to the people in the Interlake country who came here in the hundreds. They are not listening to the Farm Union people who came here a few years ago on the Legislative steps and they were outside there egging them on. When the cow-calf producers came here they were out there egging them on to pressure for \$40 million. That's what the cow-calf operators were asking for, Mr. Speaker, \$40 million they wanted in outright grants. And the Member

BILL 79

(MR. ADAM cont'd) for Lakeside has the gall to get up here and say that the farmers can do it on their own, the livestock producers can do it on their own. Well he better eat his words, because the producers in this country and this province are not believing him.

They are the same group that oppose the Property Tax Credit Plan - the same group, Mr. Speaker. The free market was \$19 million short in 1965, not to show a profit, only to cover the cost on the percentage the group of livestock producers that did enter that program. Heaven forbid if we'd been able to pay the shortfall of all the producers and all the livestock that these producers owned on which they were losing 150 to \$200 a cow. Mr. Speaker, I think that approximately 230 to 250,000 cows were enrolled in this program, and that is representing approximately 65 percent of the livestock producers.

Mr. Speaker, the free market system of which they are so proud and they applaud so loudly was short \$19 million on that percentage that were in the program. But let them not forget that the livestock who were here last year for flood assistance, they were here the year before for flood assistance and they'll be here again next year if they need it. And I believe it's the responsibility of a responsible government to answer the call of the people when they ask, the people in need, the livestock producers of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I only have a few remarks to make and they complement the remarks of the Honourable Member for Riel. I direct them to the government, not so much as a condemnation of the government, but realistically as an expression of a profound concern that we must express in this Legislature for actions by government throughout Canada at all levels, in a period of time that is complex, and with the ever growing bureaucracy that is part of the characteristic of our society today, it would seem to me that there is a need for a continued re-instatement of the necessity on the part of legislators, be they in government or in opposition, for a continual vigilance with respect to government administration and procedures as it affects the rights of the individuals.

Now I want to distinguish, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's very clear that there may very well be policy determination that infringe on rights of individuals and those rights must be protected and the concerns should be expressed, and the Honourable Member for Riel has talked about that and I don't want to repeat that argument.

But there is another facet to this that was apparent in the presentations of the whole range of legislation this session without any intent on the part of the government to in effect do some of the things that would have been accomplished had changes not occurred, and that is the continual desire on the part of those who are charged with administration, with additional ability to be able to facilitate their undertakings and the need for additional power, for the exercise of additional administrative rights and the ability to be able to execute quickly for the decision-making that is necessary. And unfortunately what happens is that we have adopted an attitude which simply said, well it really is in the interest of facilitating the procedures, and really there will be no harm in what was considered the rights of individuals before, have in fact been altered by a variety of different circumstances, so let's allow it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that vigilance is a very important factor here, not just for the legislators, not those who are the elected members, but for society as a whole. I have already referred to this and I want to make reference again - and it's rather appropriate in one sense - on the second reading of the bill, that I regret very much the fact that in Manitoba the Civil Liberties Association is defunct. I regret very much that those within our community who have an obligation as well as those who are the elected members have not seen fit to actively concern themselves with the way in which government operates at all levels and it has nothing to do particularly with one government or another. It's the concern that society must have for what is taking place. And the vigilance that I talk about is not just the vigilance of the people who are the elected members of the Legislature or the House of Commons or the municipal council levels or city levels, but rather the vigilance that must take place on the part of society and on the part of those

BILL 79

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) who have by their training and by their position some added responsibility to be concerned. And I include those who are in the universities, I include those who are in the organized groups within our community, in the whole non governmental field, and I include those who are members of the Bar. I think that responsibility has to be exercised, and I would suggest that if we examine what has happened in the past there has been a tendency not to be as vigilant as they should and I would suggest that that vigilance has to be shown. And the profound concern that I expressed is very real, with really no intent in those administrative levels for the kinds of things to happen that could have happened, but rather because of the just horrendous difficulties of trying to organize our society and take responsibility; it's sort of a creeping disease in one respect, and there has to be the constant effort on the part of all those who are elected.

The last item I'll mention, and I'll close before the lunch period, I want to indicate that we have already seen the assumption by government of power during this difficult period of time with respect to the economy of our country. We are going to be entering very shortly what has been referred to as the post-control period and it may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that next year we will be dealing with legislation, or complementary legislation which would be in the post-control period, preparation or first stage, and the thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the post-control period may in fact be a greater control period. --(Interjection)-- Well I wonder. I'm not sure. I don't know. But it would seem to me --(Interjection)-- no, no, I want to explain - no, no, I'm not talking about Bill 20, we'll deal with that afterwards from my point of view. I'm not talking about Bill 20, I'm talking about post-control period with respect to the actions of Provincial Governments complementing that of the Federal Government's program. I am suggesting that in the years to come, because I think the conditions within our economy are going to be that serious that there will in fact be the need for government action, that in the post-control period there may very well be the need, or the expressed need, at least, to in fact be held under control to an even greater extent than we have so far, and it would seem to me that the basic argument with respect to vigilance is something that we have to apply continually and something that we have to be concerned. And I talk in terms of that period as not an action that I can foresee of this particular government but something that will be basic in trying to deal with those problems of our economy that require to be solved because of the acute position that we may find ourselves in, and I think that that must be concern for ourselves.

I am, Mr. Speaker, happy to say that in many cases the government saw fit when notice was drawn to their attention of the various administrative actions that would in fact infringe on liberties to correct them, and I think to that extent that the exercise we go through is fairly important and very necessary. I would agree with the Honourable Member for Riel that the time limit we have is really not conducive to really adequate study, and I guess one of the problems we have with the community response is that in terms of our procedures they find it very difficult to be able to appear or find it very difficult to understand the way in which we operate. Although, again historically it could be suggested that what we're doing now is what has happened in the last period of time. But that doesn't make it right, Mr. Speaker. And the fact is that last night in dealing with one particular act where there is a question to have two presentations at midnight is rather ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, particularly when they are the first representations on a bill that was referred to Law Amendments for the first time last night. And I cite that as an example only to indicate that I think our procedures have to be altered and changed to be consistent with the vigilance that should take place and with the need for governments and for those who are elected to understand that there is a requirement for consideration, for public debate, for an awareness by those who are affected to be known, or an awareness to be recognized and for information to be supplied. We have that obligation and our procedures in the future should be altered to take that into consideration.

The argument that has happened in the past is not a valid one although it is possibly an excuse for what has happened now. I suggest to you that the improvement is required and that improvement should take the form that has been suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

BILL 79

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Member for River Heights, given that he has worried out loud as to the kind of circumstances that will apply after the period of restraints is lifted, is he advocating that we should necessarily commit ourselves now to absolutely no irrational restraints at that time?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that's really the point, I think that there is going to be a need for rational restraint and I think the post-control period is indicating that. But again I think there has to be a concern for the rights of people at that time and I think the balance is going to be a very difficult one, and while there is sort of an assumption that once we get over this initial period that the post-control period will in fact be less of a control, it's conceivable that it will be a greater control even though it is a post-control.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and CARRIED.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader wish to make the motion to adjourn?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and CARRIED and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.