

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, June 29, 1971

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 16, Resolution 48-(a)(1) Minister's Salary. The Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping to make some remarks in French and I had prepared myself for about two hours for my opening remarks, but because of the limited time that we have at our disposal I will cut my remarks as much as I feel I must to allow the members of the Opposition time to question the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development. I have about four or five pages of remarks in French that I will not read, that I will not comment on. They are for the perusal of the members who wish to have copies and for the members of the press if they so desire.

Mr. Chairman, it is my duty and privilege to introduce the ensuing year's Estimates for the Department of Health and Social Development. In order to understand and evaluate the 1971-72 Estimates for my department, it is imperative to have a view of the context within which the Estimates have been developed and are proposed.

The quality of the human condition varies widely in the Province of Manitoba, from the abundantly affluent who enjoy a life of convenience to the aching poor who often live in squalor and disease; from those who face a new day with a feeling of security and hope to the fearful and insecure whose only prospect in the new day is greater despair; from lives characterized by involvement, acceptance and love to those filled with alienation, rejection and hate; from people who sense their own worth and power to those whose every moment is failure and disappointment; from healthy and vital environments to socially and physically diseased environments which are dying if not dead. Most Manitobans live somewhere in between the extreme in each of these conditions, but far too many live at a negative end of one or more of them.

It is a sad commentary, Mr. Chairman, that in a land of expanding wealth, knowledge, technology and opportunity, there exists a widening gap in the qualities of life in Manitoba. While the government of Manitoba recognizes that the solution to these health and social development problems requires concentrated and co-ordinated actions of all government departments and the private sector, it is the particular mandate of the Department of Health and Social Development to treat and to prevent, insofar as possible, personal, family and community health and social problems in Manitoba.

The administration of such a mandate is of course partially defined by the quality of the human condition in Manitoba which I have just described, but it is also shaped by the resources available to attack these problems. Though it may be a commonplace observation, it is nonetheless significant to state that these resources, both financially and organizationally, are extremely limited relative to over-all need in our province. We are thus in a time of infinitely expanding need and demand for services while being equipped with finite resources with which to respond.

Consequently, the challenge we face is of a dual nature. First, it must involve effort to control escalating health and social care costs; and secondly, it must include the over-all quality and effectiveness of health and social services, particularly preventive services so as to minimize the extent and nature of health and social problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly discuss a summary of the major strategies we plan to utilize in the 1971-72 fiscal year.

(a) Reorganization of the Department. Firstly, we believe that one of the primary strategies in meeting this dual challenge is the development of an organization which operates an integrated health and social service delivery system, and administers this system in a decentralized manner so that the delivery of services can, to a maximum extent, reflect local needs and priorities. The department therefore is moving towards an organization which integrates its personal health, public health, mental health, social services and correction programs at all levels, from the broad policy level including research and planning related thereto to the administration and delivery system, while at the same time establishing a structure which encourages decentralized decision-making in regional and local areas. I could expand on this later on during the Estimates.

(b) Community Health and Social Services Centre. Closely related to this concept of reorganization is the development of community based health and social services centres which reflect a shift of priorities from highly expensive institutional care and treatment services to

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) less expensive non-institutional services which are prevention-oriented. These centres will be the primary vehicle through which my department will create an integrated and decentralized health and social service delivery system. Since this approach is still relatively unexplored, we will be developing a number of models, including modifications to, and integration of, existing departmental offices as well as experimental demonstration non-government models which would operate under local community boards.

Mr. Chairman, I've asked the Clerk of the House to place before you a paper entitled "Proposed Model for Community Health Centre Demonstration". This paper sets forth the general guidelines for a community health centre to be operated under local control. You will note that there are three central principles incorporated on the proposed model.

The first is the required citizens board that provides for local consumer sponsorship and participation to ensure that the health centre operates effectively and responsibly under appropriate local control.

The second principle calls for an integration of health services with social services in a group practice of teamwork study.

And the third principle involves a shift away from fee for service, financing through a payment system that effectively promotes preventive care and the most rational use of various resources in the broad field of health and social services.

Mr. Chairman, this general model would be adapted to the specific needs and circumstances of each particular community and will be attempted in several communities on a trial demonstration basis beginning during the coming year. We have five under way now.

Expansion and Development of Crucially Needed Programs. While structural changes will favourably affect the quantity and the quality of services, certain of the more critical program areas will need to be expanded or modified in order to meet our dual objective. The specific programs involved will be discussed at a later point during my Estimates if the time is given.

Development of Consumer and Citizen Participation. Mr. Chairman, citizen participation and the carrying out of the mandate of the department must be seen both as a democratic right and as an essential instrument in planning for providing health and social services. It is for both of these reasons that my department intends to increase the role of this function. The Welfare Advisory Committee, which advises citizens of their rights under the Social Allowance Act and hears appeals against administrative decisions, will extend its activities in 1971-72. Also, legislation will be introduced shortly - it has, for first reading - to establish a Manitoba Health and Social Development Advisory Council which, as a citizen council, will address itself to the total program area of the Department of Health and Social Development.

The Scandinavian Investigation Visit. In discussing the department's response to the broad-ranging health and social service needs of Manitoba citizens, it is appropriate that I make reference to the special investigation visit that was made in the Scandinavian countries last December by myself and members of my department. A complete report of this trip will be presented to you very shortly. It is now lying on the table. Unfortunately, there is no time here to go into a lengthy description of what was learned on our visit, but this is included in the written report now before you.

Certainly the extensive knowledge and the information we gathered on this short two week trip will greatly assist us as we try to formulate new policies and programs which must surely come if Manitobans are to truly reap the benefits of a progressive and socially conscious society.

The Scandinavian countries have developed one of the highest standards of living on the globe, and I think it is a credit to the New Democratic Party to indicate that the majority of countries visited are governed by the Social Democratic Party, our political counterparts. It is by their earnest dedication to serve people first and by their premise that says what is good for people will ultimately be good for the economy and for business - as does our philosophy - that the Scandinavian countries do rank as world leaders in provision of excellent health, welfare, correctional and co-operative programs. We came home with invaluable knowledge in all these fields, and hopefully we can take what we feel is viable, progressive and applicable to Manitoba and apply it to our own already improving programs.

There is, Mr. Chairman, an essential and indispensable ingredient behind all of these strategies I have just mentioned. The energy and commitment of people, whether they are civil servants of my department and/or the Health Services Commission, members of the

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) private voluntary sector or participants of citizen boards and commissions, they have all made invaluable contributions, not only in the Department of Health and Social Development but in all departments of government. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to extend my gratitude both to those who have participated in this challenge and to those who will be contributing in the future.

Mr. Chairman, you see before you my departmental expenditure estimates for 1971-72 totalling \$168.7 million. This amount represents an increase of some \$32.9 million over the amount of \$135.8 million voted for last year. I gave figures a few weeks ago pertaining to the over-expenditures in the department, and I would like to correct the statement that I made then and give you more accurate figures. In Administration and Central Services we were actually overspent by \$42,000; Mental Health and Corrections, underspent by \$758,000; Public Health, underspent by \$211,500; in Social Services, overspent by \$10,328,300; Elderly and Infirm Persons Housing, underspent by \$72,500; Agency Relations, actually overspent by \$140,600; total over-expenditure of \$9,468,900. Revenue received in excess of budgeted revenue, \$7,015,900; net over-expenditure of \$2,453,000.

Even though when we talk of an increase of \$32.9 million over last year - this is really a healthy increase - a wide range of imminent needs will still exist and many worthwhile programs will have to be postponed to another year. The increase provided for in this year's Estimates is necessitated by the following reasons.

Firstly, over one-half of the increase, or \$17.5 million is an expanding social allowance program including costs associated with care of elderly - and I will comment on this later.

Secondly, about one-third of the increase, or \$11.2 million is for increased costs of medical and hospital insurance programs.

Thirdly, the remaining \$4.2 million increase is attributed to a variety of other specific program increases and to generally increased costs which I will outline right away.

Because we are, Mr. Chairman, at this time only considering the expenditure side of my department's estimates, I would like to assure you that large increases in revenue, primarily from the Federal Government, has resulted from my vigorous approach to the Government of Canada in exploring and negotiating new avenues of cost sharing in the areas of special dependent care, aid to students, administrative overhead costs, including data processing and other programs whose costs were not previously shared by the Federal Government. When these increased revenues are taken into account, the net increase of operating the Department of Health and Social Development and the Health Services Commission during 1971-72 will be \$22 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to turn to the estimated expenditures of my department on a division by division basis, beginning with Mental Health. The Mental Health expenditures estimates for 1971-72 are \$17.7 million, which represents a 6.1 increase over that voted in the previous year. We are continuing to upgrade the quality of institutional care while shifting emphasis to non-institutional community mental health services. In the past year the Selkirk Hospital for Mental Diseases became the first and only mental hospital in western Canada to be fully accredited. Since opposition members are taking a great interest in touring departmental institutions, I would urge them to tour this facility in Selkirk. This year's estimates provide for some minimal further improvement in the operation of this hospital and further operating and facilities and services at the Brandon Hospital for Mental Disease.

In addition, our institutions for the care of the mentally retarded are being significantly upgraded in a number of ways. At the Manitoba School for Retardates in Portage la Prairie, two new cottages, two new cottage-type facilities planned as an integral part of the rehabilitative process will soon be in operation, as will a new physiotherapy unit for the treatment of multiple-handicapped patients. The addition of 24 staff man years will provide for greater shift of emphasis from maintenance to rehabilitative service. At the St. Amant Ward of the St. Vital Hospital, plans are being finalized for expanded facilities and improved services.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. TOUPIN: We just received approval for the expenditure at the St. Amant Ward. While development of institutional mental health programs are proceeding, the major emphasis will be given to developing non-institutional community services. Through improved rationalization of our staffing plans, the expansion of community mental health services to northern areas of the province will be achieved; and through the introduction of community health and social services centres, community mental health services will be further expanded.

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, I turn now to the Corrections Division of my department. In 1971-72, estimates for the corrections programs which includes adult and juvenile probationary service, is \$5.5 million. This includes a \$350,000 increase over the previous year. Major improvements in correctional and probationary services have been made in the past year, considering the poor quality of physical facilities and services my government inherited from the previous administration. We are now in process of completing what is intended to be a government White Paper on Corrections which will set forth a new strategy for effective rehabilitation of public offenders. It will reflect much of what we learned in Scandinavia and will represent a most progressive approach in the corrections field in Canada, if not to say North America.

In the meantime, we are proceeding on several fronts to upgrade our Corrections Program and this is reflected in the estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development. Physical facilities and rehabilitative programs and services at the Headingley correctional institution are being significantly improved. During the past year, and for final implementation in the upcoming year, I am pleased to announce a fully operational day pool program which is geared to assist the rehabilitative struggles of inmates at Dauphin, Brandon, Headingley and Winnipeg. For the first time as well, we now have in Manitoba a Pay Incentive Program which was recently initiated in this province. This means that inmates on discharge will have a means to support themselves during that terrible critical period immediately following discharge, and I believe this single program is one of the most important programs in this department from the inmates' viewpoint to be introduced in some time.

Looking at new correctional facilities, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to advise that work will soon commence on the Manitoba Youth Centre, a juvenile Reception Centre in Winnipeg. The design of this facility and the services to be provided in it will represent the most advanced approach to the rehabilitation of juvenile public offenders. Plans for improved correctional facilities at Brandon and The Pas are actively being investigated. In short, my department is striving to forge ahead within the limitation of budget and priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I will now discuss the estimates for Public Health Services. The Estimates for 1971-72 are for \$17.3 million, an increase of \$2.8 million over 1970-71. This increase reflects some significant improvement in public health programming, including the extension of public health services for the first time to all areas of the Province. Firstly, dental health services, primarily in northern Manitoba, where they are urgently needed.

Secondly, diagnostic laboratory and X-ray facilities and services will be established in the Northern, Red River, Stonewall health units.

Thirdly, the further development of family planning services will be achieved in areas of greatest need.

Fourthly, care services, which involves mainly payments to nursing homes for care of needy elderly and infirm patients, will be increased.

And fifthly, a new provincial-wide rubella measles screening program, which has been recommended by the Dominion Council of Health and the Minister's technical advisory committee, will be introduced in 1971-72.

In addition, a thorough study of our public health program is being undertaken for the purpose of better rationalizing staff utilization and maximizing the effectiveness of these services as they are re-formed into a more effective delivery system.

I will now review the Social Services Division of my department. Much criticism, Mr. Chairman, of an unjustified nature has been levied at the social allowance program because of its rapidly escalating costs. I found out that this matter of rising costs is not unique in Manitoba nor is it unique in Canada. Rising costs to provide for the needy and unfortunate in our society is a North American problem.

My 1971-72 Estimates for Social Services Division are \$56.6 million, an increase of \$16.8 million over the previous year. It should be stressed that this money will provide not only for the direct payment of social allowances but also for the care of the elderly in institutions, reimbursement to municipalities for municipal allowances, maintenance of children, and for the government social allowance health services program.

Much of the responsibility for increased cost is directly attributable to the federal economic policies which have contributed heavily to the general unemployment picture in our country. Other factors such as increased knowledge of recipient rights, and an increased demand by mothers who are deserted and widowed, account for the balance of the increased

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) costs. This government is seriously interested in looking after those recipients who are really in need of social assistance. Of recent date, certain changes affecting single persons over the age of 18 has been introduced in an attempt to channel funds only to those who are in need. Other changes are being considered which, together with changes in administrative procedures, will further provide for those who are legitimately in need.

The next divisional vote which I will briefly speak on is that required for the administration of the Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act. For this program in 1971-72 I am requesting a vote under the main Supply Bill of \$296,500. I stress the words "under the main Supply Bill" because the amount requested, which is an apparent reduction of \$293,000, does not fully indicate my department's program with regard to accommodation for the senior and infirm citizens of the province. The amount of \$296,000 requested in 1971-72 is primarily to cover debt servicing charge on housing projects completed in prior years. Funds totalling close to one million dollars for the initiation and implementation of new projects is available from previously voted non-lapsing capital funds.

Our program for the ensuing year will be continued as in the past on a partnership basis, comprised of my government and various non-profit organizations throughout the province using provincial and private funds and borrowing from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. At the present time, the office of research and planning in my department is undertaking an extensive study to determine the extent, type and geographic need for additional accommodation for the elderly. This study, together with a rationalization and integration of housing programs under the Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act with those carried out by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, will provide for a properly planned approach to meet the needs of the elderly and other citizens of our province who for economic reasons are not now adequately accommodated for.

During 1970, 32 projects providing accommodation for 1,800 elderly or infirm persons either began construction or received grants and loan approval from the Department of Health and Social Development. Actually completed and put into use were 18 projects providing an additional 692 beds. Because of the difficulty of predicting the timing of constructions, I cannot say how many units will come . . . in the current year, but I can safely predict that during 1971 there will be no less and probably more beds made available than was the case in 1970. Citizens in over 70 Manitoba communities can take pride in the fact that by the end of Manitoba's Centennial year, through their non-profit organizations and in co-operation with the Provincial Government, has sponsored elderly and infirm housing projects which will provide specially designed living accommodations for more than 7,400 persons in 72 communities throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the division of Agency Relations which appears as Resolution No. 53 on Page 20 of the printed Estimates of Current Expenditures. For this division I am requesting approval for a vote of \$5.98 million. This compares to \$5.32 million in 1970-71, being an increase of \$665,000 or 12 percent.

This division, Mr. Chairman, is responsible for my government's grants program to health and social service agencies in the province. These grants range from small general purpose grants to cover the administrative costs to large grants in support of agency programs. They provide support for agencies operating in the fields of public health, mental health, corrections and social services. In part, the increase in this appropriation reflects my government's concern for the native people of our province by providing increased support to the Indian and Metis Friendship Centres and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. Additional amounts are provided in the Estimates for support of agencies which have as their concern rehabilitation of public offenders and those suffering from the abuse of alcohol and drugs. Concern for the senior citizen is also reflected in these Estimates by providing increased funds for agencies operating in this field. Increased costs in the care of retarded children at the St. Amant Ward is also provided for.

A breakdown of the grants which will be made from this appropriation will be available during detailed discussion of my Estimates. During 1970-71 the Agency Relations Division continues to work towards improved liaison between the Manitoba Government and the many health and social service agencies which the government financially supports either directly by grants or by the purchase of services. Continued improvement in this regard is foreseen during 1971-72.

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that the Legislature has been asked to vote funds for the Office of Research and Planning. As I indicated earlier, it is imperative to rationalize the delivery of services for which this department is responsible if we are to meet the challenge of increasing demands and costs in the field with limited resources at our disposal. Without precise and comprehensive research and planning we will be unable to either maximize the utilization of existing resources or provide the most effective health and social service delivery system. The absence of a formal research and planning function in the department in the past was most unfortunate and we are proceeding to correct the inherited deficiency.

Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the Estimates for the Manitoba Health Services Commission I would like to indicate that, as an initial stage in the integration of my department's delivery system, the Manitoba Services Commission was established on October 21st, 1970, combining the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation. The hospital and medical insurance programs therefore are being continued in a more integrated manner under the new Commission as the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Plan which was authorized under the Health Services Insurance Act, Manitoba, passed during the 1970 Legislative Session.

In 1971 it is estimated that hospital costs will amount to \$104.5 million. Medical and other health services will total \$57.4 million for a total of \$161.9 million, excluding administration, as compared to \$146.1 million in 1970, an approximate increase of 10.9 percent. These estimates demonstrate an increase in health services costs for each man, woman and child resident in Manitoba from \$150.00 per year in 1970 to \$165.00 for 1971.

Mr. Chairman, I am most distressed by these rapidly accelerating health service costs. Obviously the rate of increase cannot be tolerated indefinitely, however one might be able to reconcile this financial burden if they were at a corresponding increase in health services for Manitobans. But this is not the case. Many barely adequate health services still remain for a variety of Manitobans.

As I indicated earlier, one of the methods we are planning to employ to attain a higher degree of effectiveness and efficiency from our human and financial resources is the reshaping of our health care delivery system. Applied to this situation it will mean a greater control over further expansion of expensive hospital facilities and greater emphasis on the development of less expensive and more prevention-oriented ambulatory care services such as community services centres and home care services.

The Manitoba Health Services Commission has recently entered into a formal agreement with the Manitoba Medical Association in establishing a new medical review committee to examine patterns of medical practice, including the cost and quality of such practice. The commission continues to work closely with the College of Physicians and Surgeons in developing a standard approval program concerning laboratory and X-ray diagnostic services. The Manitoba Health Services Commission also continues to work closely with the medical profession. Ninety percent of Manitoba doctors are now operating within the plan as opposed to 79 percent as of December 31st, 1969 and 65 percent when the plan began.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding my remarks, let me reiterate the rationale and strategy behind the formation of these Estimates. We are faced with a challenge of providing more comprehensive and higher quality health and social services within limited financial and human resources at a time when the cost of these services are escalating rapidly. I believe that the 1971-72 Estimates for the Department of Health and Social Development reflect a most progressive attempt at meeting this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I have now completed my opening remarks and relinquish the floor for the Committee's detailed consideration and approval of the Department of Health and Social Development's 1971-72 Estimates of current expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first how much we appreciate the fact that we are able to have this opportunity to scrutinize the expenditures, the estimated expenditures of the Department of Health and Social Development. I think there are a number of reasons why we are especially interested in this department. For one reason, the amounts spent are escalating, as the Minister has said, at a far greater rate within this department than in any other area of government spending.

I really am not certain that the Minister has explained sufficiently well to me, at least

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) as yet, the \$8 million in unexpected revenues as set off against the \$10 million over-expenditure that had been anticipated. I don't believe there is any other possible source of revenue to this department than the federal cost-sharing programs, and I would like to hear from the Minister whether this is indeed where the money came from. In that case, I think that an \$8 million error in the accounting and billing system would be a matter of some concern and also a matter for which we should have a good explanation. It's difficult to imagine such an astronomical error being able to take place in any well run department. If it is simply the additional revenues, or reflect the additional revenues which came to the province as a result of the tax-sharing with the Federal Government, then that money wasn't really authorized to be spent in this department, at least not by the Legislature, so I think we would appreciate very much having a further explanation as to where the \$8 million came from.

The net over-expenditure the Minister says is approximately \$2 million. Now this as I say -- (Interjection) -- a net over-expenditure of \$30 million? I think I won't waste my time replying to that question, Mr. Chairman. We had to resort to some pretty extreme statements in order to try to get some sort of a response from the government, which we didn't really get at the time.

Now instead, Mr. Chairman, of being diverted in that direction, I would like to talk about the expenditures of the department a little further. In 1971 the estimates that were passed were for \$136,693,800. In the left hand column in the estimates before us at the present time for 1972, the left hand column is supposed to represent actual expenditures. I assume this went to press before the total financial picture was available, because according to this sum the department actually spent about a million dollars less than had been passed for that department's use - \$135,850,800 - it's exactly a million less. There probably is an explanation for this as well.

Our Orders-in-Council indicate that a further \$7 1/2 million was drawn by this department in special warrants. Now these I understand will appear, I assume will appear in supplementary estimates. What puzzles me at this point is whether the \$8 million unexpected revenues were in addition to the \$135 million and, if so, it would balance off the \$7 1/2 million that had been drawn in special warrants. Is it \$135 million plus the extra \$8 million plus \$7 1/2 million in special warrants, or are we to hope at this point that at least the \$6 million that were drawn for social allowances programs will be put back into the Consolidated Fund as not being needed. Otherwise, if all of this money is now available to the department, the sums that were passed last year plus \$8 million plus another further \$7 1/2 million, I think we want a very serious answer about those special warrants. I don't think we would be very happy to see them simply be made available as additional glory funds for pork barrelling or a honey pot or whatever you'd like to call it. If these are indeed now surplus, I would like to hear that they are going back into the Consolidated Fund.

We really must have a clear understanding of the finances of this department, Mr. Chairman, because there really appears, from the manner in which the expenditures have mushroomed, that there's little discipline applied to the spending habits or desires within that department. Between 1969 when the NDP government assumed power and the 1970 budget a year later, expenditures had already risen by 23 percent. Between 1970 and '71, they rose another 26 percent, and now in the 1972 estimates these figures are 25 percent above those of 1971. The total increase in spending over 1969 until 1972, which represents three years of NDP planning, the expenditures of this department went up 93 percent - a cool 93 percent.

Now we have received some explanations as to where this money has gone but they are not really entirely satisfactory. We know that unemployment was severe - and let's check those figures out too. I think in 1970 - I'm not certain where my figures were but I believe unemployment went up, the number of persons went up by something like eight percent.

For the period of 1969 to 1972, the number of persons who actually received financial assistance from the public purse was up by 31 percent from 55,120 to 73,695. Now being an inquisitive sort of a person, I sought to learn what portion of a dollar that is spent in this department actually reaches the person in need. Now I think that all of us realize that much money is expended in this department in the salaries of public health personnel, social workers, counsel people, probation officers, staffs of correctional institutions and so forth, but it's still interesting to learn how much of the dollar that is spent actually goes into fighting poverty. Mr. Chairman, my figures show that 30.2 cents of each dollar reaches the hand of the person

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) who's in need. In 1969 when the NDP government took office, 32.2 cents of the dollar reached the poor. Now while the department's expenditures have risen 93 percent, the proportion spent on financial assistance is down two percent.

During the past year, that is in 1970, the number of civil servants in the department has increased by 336. Whereas Dr. Johnson employed one Executive Assistant at a salary of \$9,000, the present Minister is supported by two executive assistants and one special assistant besides the deputy. These three special executive assistants are the people whose responsibility lies in the political field, who help in constituency matters, speech writing, and just generally helping the Minister out with odds and ends you might say.

Now while the Minister's expenditures mushroomed, it is interesting to notice what is happening with the agencies, for instance, that take care of governments wards - the Children's Aid Society, Knowles School for Boys, Sir High John MacDonald Hostel, the Children's Home, who can't manage on the per diem rate of payment that they received last year due to inflation and higher minimum wages, costs and so forth, yet they are told "hold the line", and it is difficult to understand, Mr. Chairman, what the department's priorities are.

I think that an explanation perhaps is also forthcoming from the Minister who has stated that there are plans to proceed very shortly with a Youth Centre, but at the present time there is still the practice of keeping wards of the Children's Aid Society, children who have been neglected or perhaps deserted and are being held for the Children's Aid Society, are being kept in the same building as delinquent girls. They apparently are segregated part of the time but they do eat their meals together I am told. Now some of these wards are as young as eight years of age, and they cannot help but be impressionable if they are going to be kept in the company of delinquent girls for any period of time.

No mention has been made by the Minister of the Hunt Commission report and its findings. Actually, the report brought forth very little that was new. It put down in one place information which had been brought forward through the Federal Task Force on the Conference of Health Service in Canada - much of it was taken from that; there is a bit of the Willard Commission Report of - I forget, perhaps as much as ten years ago; and this report hasn't really told us very much that we didn't already know. It came into being because of complaints of inequities and preferential treatment in the hospitals in allocating beds and privileges, but it said that active staff, specialists had an unfair advantage in admitting patients because of the number of beds that had been reserved for teaching.

Now not every doctor wants to teach, but over the years before Medicare, and even to the present time, there are many doctors who are associated with the Winnipeg General Hospital and St. Boniface who teach for the University's Medical College. They teach large numbers of medical students and post graduate doctors with really a token remuneration - I forget what it is, I think it's gone up from \$100 to \$200 a year - teaching every day, giving lectures and so on, so that they're still making a very considerable contribution to society simply by the teaching process, and it's quite likely that all of the problems that had occurred could have been solved if there had been a decision to have one university hospital.

Now it's true that a team of doctors would be given a certain number of teaching beds - I am not certain how many on a team. There might have been seven doctors on a team; say, seven surgeons. They had a definite number of beds and the competition between these doctors for those beds I think was a pretty good means of ensuring that the patients were kept moving. No doctor was ever out from under the scrutiny of the other doctors who wanted to use the same beds. But by the time the number of beds necessary had been set aside, there really wasn't sufficient bed space left for the courtesy staff and the other doctors who would have liked to have taken their patients into the hospitals. They objected to having to turn them over to the teaching staff in some instances in order to get them into beds.

Now, undoubtedly, additional alternate care would help to release some beds; however in the large centres there's a real accumulation of more sophisticated weaponry for fighting disease and it's a very desirable resource, and one which really all of the doctors would like to have as supportive help. In 1961, the Willard Hospital Survey Report suggested the rating of 6.8 beds per thousand population, as it was in 1959. They felt that this should be raised to 7.3 beds per thousand by 1965, and they thought that this should do for some years after that. I would like to know what the present judgment is, if we are developing alternate methods of delivery of service, and has a figure been reached which would be an ideal number of beds per thousand to be set aside for the high grade care that one gets when in a hospital.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)

There was also within the Minister's remarks an absence of any recognition of the need for crisis services within this community. I mentioned this on another occasion but more briefly. What concerns me is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to Rule 19 (2), Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

. Continued on next page

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Private bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to look over this bill concerning the occupational therapists and we have no objection to its proceeding. I understand that it's a bill that has been asked for by the Association of Occupational Therapists and undoubtedly we'll hear from them when the matter goes before Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we are talking about occupational therapists, Mr. Speaker, I would ask each and every member of the Chamber to remember the rather impassioned plea that was made last year by the Member for Wolseley on behalf of the physiotherapists whom he felt had been left out of the Medical Services insurance system and had played such a vital part in the health of patients who were recovering from severe illnesses. And so, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask each and every member of this Chamber to look back in Hansard and read the speech of the Member for Wolseley in his plea on behalf of the physiotherapists because I believe it is quite applicable at this time when we are attempting to recognize a particular group, and this was basically the plea of the Member for Wolseley that this group be recognized although at that time I admit that the recognition he wanted was somewhat different than that that is in this bill, but I would ask the members of the House to consider once again the speech of the Member for Wolseley on that particular occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Osborne will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to me to find that the Bill 43, a bill to incorporate the Occupational Therapists, will proceed to Law Amendments. I hope that when the bill is before committee, representatives of the Association will be able to appear to give the reasons that they have for the passage of this bill, and I hope that it can be reported back from that committee.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The following is a public bill, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and the honourable members will recall the Honourable Member for Rhineland was absent and it was indicated that other members, if they wished to speak, may do so. The Honourable Member for Emerson had 10 minutes left. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realized the day after the last time this bill was discussed in the House that I must have been a little more harsh than I really wanted to be, because even the press people thought that maybe I was a little hard on the member that introduced the bill. I was under the impression, of course, that bills introduced in the House by members are necessarily convictions of those members and they stand behind the bill and want to enforce it and so on, and I understand that maybe in this case the member might have been a vehicle in order to introduce the bill and therefore it doesn't necessarily mean that he fully supports the bill, and I'd be very eager to hear the comments of the honourable member when he does close debate.

I'd like to reiterate, however, that I think this bill is an unworkable piece of legislation. It's unfair in the sense that it does not spell out who is going to be making the assessment of the property that is going to be assessed and parcelled out. I think it would be imprudent on the part of the Legislature to pass this kind of bill without clearly spelling out that particular section. I also think it would be unfair to pass this kind of bill when you consider that the 18-year old and the 65-year old, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Highways, would both be probably in line for the same kind of payment on leaving the colony. I can't help,

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) Mr. Speaker, but equate the colony's kind of living to that of religious orders that do exist now who do live a communal kind of life, who relinquish private ownership, who live without the thought of obtaining things that have been earned by those orders when they leave on their own wishes. I think this bill might have been better considered had it been more carefully drawn up. What we're doing in this bill is not curing the ill, is not satisfying totally the ill that exists; I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this bill throws out the baby with the bath water, and I would be remiss if I didn't say to those who are convinced that this area needs legislation that, before they introduce another bill, they ought to study it very carefully and know that they introduce the kind of bill that will not have with it the ills that this one will carry.

MR. CHERNIACK: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GIRARD: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the honourable member under the impression that he is debating a government bill?

MR. GIRARD: I can't hear you. Would you . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the honourable member under the impression that he is debating a government bill?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that this bill is not considered a government bill. I hope, however, that the government front benchers will not all sit down and be quiet about it, that we will hear their opinion. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier himself will make his contribution to this bill, and I am also of the opinion that, in spite of not being a government bill, tradition seems to be in this House that when a member introduces a bill it would seem that he has some support in those ranks and I find it unusual if he doesn't have any support.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit another question?

MR. GIRARD: Sure.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member give us the benefit of his experience as to the tradition in the introduction of Private Members' bills. How many years has the honourable member spent in this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is not relevant to the debate of the resolution. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Emerson is finished, I intend to make some comments in connection with Bill No. 44, which is The Communal Colony Property Act. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed, to say the least, to see a bill like this come forward in the House in the Manitoba Legislature. But, as the sponsor of the bill stated and I think the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye when speaking on the bill the other night quoted apparently from the Member for Winnipeg Centre's remarks and said that one of the reasons why perhaps he came to thinking of it was the fact that one of the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of Canada had suggested that certain aspects of holding property should be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of the bill is much, much deeper than what apparently is looked at at first glance when you look at the bill. The effect means the disintegration of the communal colonies here in Manitoba as they have been known heretofore. Certainly we cannot accept a piece of legislation of this type when we, as individual members, believe in freedom. Every day we get the Free Press, although some members might not like the Free Press. On the editorial page we see the caption, "Freedom of Trade, Liberty of Religion, Equality of Civil Rights." These are the three principles that they uphold. Just the other week, the other day, we were told by the First Minister of this province that they subscribe to the text of the Charter drawn at the Victoria gathering of the First Ministers and the Prime Minister of Canada. And what does this particular text say? I would like to read two sections of it. "Part 1 - Rights, Article 1: It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada every person has the following fundamental freedoms: Freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; and freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and all laws shall be construed and applied so as not to abrogate or abridge any such freedom. Article 2: No law of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislatures of the provinces shall abrogate or abridge any of the fundamental freedoms herein recognized and declared." And it continues.

Mr. Speaker, these are the freedoms that we are speaking of and I am sure that if I had the British North America Act here I could quote from it as well. However, if we are going to start with the meddling of freedoms such as is proposed in the bill, who is going to be next? This is one particular group, one particular sect, but who will be next and where will it end?

(MR. FROESE cont'd) This particular sect originated away back in the sixteenth century and they had certain principles which they accepted as a group and have abided by, and these were naturally voluntarily accepted. Otherwise no one is prevented from leaving them or not accepting them in the first place. But some of these principles are, and one that is very basic is the principle of sharing, which means common ownership, and this is what they've been practising for all these many years. This is part of their concept and a tenet of their basic beliefs. These people have been engaged in agriculture over all these years. They don't pry into other people's lives and other types of business. It's basically agriculture and has been that for all these many years. I am just wondering in a day and age where the Federal Government is trying to eliminate all the farmers or most of the farmers in Canada, whether this will not be the group that will be able to maintain the brunt and come through whereas many others will fall by the wayside.

The concept of communal ownership or common ownership is more or less identical to that of co-operative farms, yet we have seen many co-ops, co-operative farms formed right here in Manitoba as well as in other provinces. But none of them, not a single one, has been able to retain that form of ownership and make a go of it. They have all capitulated one after another, and what is the reason for this? The reason is that you require a much stronger bond than just the common bond that is common in cooperatives, in other associations. You need a much stronger bond and this is the spiritual bond that these people accepted in their faith, in their way of life, and this has maintained these groups for all these many years and it's virtually centuries that they have come through in this way.

The only other area where cooperatives, farm cooperatives or collectives are being practiced and care able to be maintained, is in Socialist Soviet Russia and this is where it's forced on them. These people have no choice. They have to remain in them and many of these people in those communals are just having a bare existence and at poverty levels, and if they don't abide in a certain way they are just done away with. We have people coming across from there from time to time and they relate the stories to us of what is happening in those countries, and this is fact, that they have these collectives and the production in those cooperative farms or collectives is very small. In fact, production has never gone up the way it does in a free society like in our country, and this is why these people are allowed to have a few acres of land of their own on which they produce their necessary -- grow their vegetables and so on, so that they are able to make a living.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure just how much time I have but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has eleven minutes.

MR. FROESE: But certainly, what this bill proposes to do and what it provides for is that where a member leaves the colony he is entitled to one half of an equal share of the assets of the colony concerned, and this is to be paid out in a given time period. On the surface this looks very fair, and innocently acceptable. However, on closer examination, it hits at the very root of the communal colony, on its existence and continuation. If this were brought into effect, these colonies would be disintegrating one after another and within a matter of time they would all be eliminated, because you cannot carry on a communal colony of the type when persons would be leaving and they would have a right to ask for a proportionate share - and, in mentioning the share, certainly, as other members have already pointed out, the Honourable Minister of Highways, that an 18-year old can demand the same share as another person who's probably worked and toiled for 30, 40, 50 years, and they would be equally entitled to a similar share. This is another thing that's wrong with the bill.

However, if this were to pass, pressure would be on members of the colonies from all sides and especially the younger people. The pressure would be on to leave the colony and collect their portion, just like the Prodigal Son, and communal colonies couldn't exist under such legislation. It would be the beginning of a complete breakdown. I am sure that ways and means could be found by these groups to circumvent such legislation - I can think of several ways it could be done - but certainly this is not what we want to do and I am sure that we would not want to subject these people to such harassment when they are practising their lifelong principles and their way of life, and to deny them of the liberty of their religion.

Certainly I will not support this bill, because if we are going to do it with one group, who will be the next group? Will it be another church that has amassed a fortune or will it be another sect that subscribed to a different set of principles? And I can think of other groups of people - some of them from whom we have heard on past occasions when certain legislation

(MR. FROESE cont'd) appeared before this House. We remember, and I'm sure members will recall just a few years ago, when the Hutterian group tried to incorporate some 29 colonies here in Manitoba, the Bill was given first and second reading and it went to Law Amendments Committee. At the time, these people appeared before committee and they found that the agreement that they had made between their group and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities had been incorporated into the bill without their knowledge, and they objected to this very strenuously. In fact, when it was brought to a vote, and the vote was that the agreement be incorporated, the group withdrew all of the bills that they were proposing and all the colonies that they were proposing to incorporate at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I for one certainly do not subscribe to the principles of the bill. I have two colonies in my riding - most of the members probably have some - and certainly the colonies in my riding have not given any trouble. I have yet to hear of any trouble from the groups concerned in my riding and, as pointed out, this would be destroying their way of life and the freedom of their religion, and I would ask honourable members to vote the bill down on second reading so that it need not be carried any further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on this bill. I realize this is a Private Members' Bill and the member himself must have given it serious thought before he brought it into this Chamber because I have expressed myself before on Private Members' Bills. While you don't have to necessarily be for something when you bring it in, you naturally have to know what's involved in that bill before you bring it into this Chamber. I remember so well, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I forget whether it was 1960 or '61 when I think there were around 18 or 20 bills to be incorporated as a religious society. I remember so well the solicitor for the Hutterites at that time did include in each bill the agreement between the Hutterites and the Union of Municipalities. For that very reason the Hutterites weren't willing to go along with those bills. But I think that the mere fact that those bills went to committee brought out many things that we weren't able to know of otherwise. I often wonder, in private bills, if this is the place to kill it in second reading or whether we should kill it in committee after we hear the facts. This is one of the problems that we, as private members, have to make that decision, and I know this bill does legislate against a minority and this is one of the things. But I also know of another bill that is legislating against a minority too and that is the Insurance Act and I don't want to let the government forget that. I don't want to let the government forget that, because they are legislating against a minority.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest the honourable member confine his remarks to the bill before us and not to the Automobile Insurance Bill. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I was just only comparing the piece of legislation which everybody is condemning that we are presently looking at, but if I could have killed Bill 56 at second reading, I would have loved every minute, and if I could have killed Bill 52 I'd have loved every minute of it, and this is the reason why I'm standing up here right now, that I do believe in minorities. I do believe in minorities, and I want to put that on record right now. But sometimes people come to the conclusion that some minorities don't exist - some minorities don't exist. Well, I tell you, there's a very important minority in the province of Manitoba. We aren't very large but I take the same opinion. I voted against Bill 56 on second reading for the very same reason, and I'm undecided here. I'm undecided what to do now; I'm undecided because the government ruled against the minority. What should I do? What should I do? Should I send this bill to committee, vote to send it to committee? I'm undecided yet what to do, but I think I'll take the opposite view to what I did on the insurance bill, the opposite to what the government are doing. When the vote comes, I'm going to vote to send this bill to committee so I can hear both sides of the story, if there is two sides. And I want to hear the honourable member who brought this bill in, I want to hear his reason for bringing it in whether he explains it on the closing of second reading or whether he explains it in Private Bills committee, because I think here is a lesson to be learned by every private member in this House, that for goodness' sake, sleep on a bill before you ever bring it in. And I'm only reminding you again, if anybody else brings a bill into this House and they don't sleep on it, from now on they had better suffer the consequences.

Now I'm glad the First Minister is in his chair. I'm glad the First Minister is in his

(MR. MCKELLAR cont'd) chair, because when he votes on second reading in this Bill 52, that he remember those same people, those same innocent people that are just the same as the Hutterites, the same innocent people that are being hurt, and not only are they losing 1/100ths of the share of their colony, or 1/200ths, they are losing every nickel in their pockets including these few cents right here, taking every nickel out of my pocket, every nickel out of my pocket - and what's going to happen to my family back there? I don't know what's going to happen, but at least in this bill here, at least they get their one portion of what they own in this world. I don't know what I'll do . . .

So Mr. Speaker, I'll close by saying that let us not forget the minorities in this province of Manitoba. Let us not forget the minorities. We may be not very important; we might not speak very loud; but we mean something in the province of Manitoba. We must not lose these people out of the province of Manitoba and as mentioned in the papers, the Hutterite colonies, the Hutterites have said; if you pass the bill we're going. I don't know whether the insurance agents are all going or not. I don't know if the Honourable Member from Roblin is going; I don't know if the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is going. I don't know where I'm going - I don't know where I'm going. But I want to say that let us not forget the minorities, and I'll just close by that. When you vote on Bill 52 I'll remind you again. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been quite interested in the debate up to this point. I have been in a position that I have grown up with the Hutterite colonies. I have done business with them all my life. I have found them to be honourable people and in most cases - in all cases practically - they have stood by their word with me. This bill that is now before the House by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg South is a bill that would possibly, I'm quite sure, it would be the death knell of the Hutterite colonies and there is no way that they would stay in the province of Manitoba. I think that the people also that have left the colony, the families that have left or the individuals who have left, in most cases they realize when they are leaving, under the present set-up, the church rules are that when they leave they are entitled to nothing. This bill is designed to give them their equity when they do leave, and I think that this bill that's before us, I would support it going into Law Amendments.

I would expect that when it does go in that there will be representatives from the people that have left the colony; I'm quite sure that the elders from the colony will be there and I don't think that there will be possibly this big a problem when they do meet and get it on a common ground. I think that the colonies now realize, the elders of them, that possibly the people that are leaving, they put a lot of years of their lives into developing them; I don't think that they can take their equal equity but I think that possibly they might be able to take a percentage. It might be a given figure, say \$5,000, \$10,000 or whatever the case may be, but it might be something that would give them a start when they do decide to leave the colony. I think that possibly it's a healthy sign that some of the families are leaving. They have seen fit to go into other locations and are certainly going to contribute to society when they do it, and I'm quite interested to see what is going to happen to this bill. I am going to support it going into Law Amendments and I'm quite sure that when it does go in and the elders of the colonies and the people that have left get together on common ground, I think that they'll arrive at a formula amongst themselves and I don't think that legislation is going to be necessary. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm also one of those who is interested in the debate that has been going on insofar as this particular bill is concerned. I use just a slight difference in my terminology from my Honourable Member from Gladstone, but I want to say, I think on just a little different tone here. I think this government and the First Minister once again is playing politics. He allowed himself to get into difficulties from his Minister of Transportation and now he uses this Member for Winnipeg Centre to try to bring something into . . .

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is very short and very simple, to the point. Any suggestion that I persuaded the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre to bring in this bill is absolutely ridiculous - in fact, I believe that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, if asked, will tell the honourable member that I asked him on one or two

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) occasions if he would consider not proceeding with this bill, always understanding, of course, that it is a private member's prerogative to bring in any bill he likes, and even though as First Minister I may not like it, I will never object in any ultimate or final way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. On the matter of privilege I was rising to the same point myself. I gave the courtesy to the Honourable First Minister because it was directed against him. I should like to ask the Honourable Member for Rock Lake to withdraw the aspersions and the reflections he cast upon the Honourable First Minister.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those members in this Legislature who respects your position, Sir. If this is the way the First Minister feels from the comments that I made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. It's not how the First Minister feels. A privilege of the House has been transgressed. The honourable member can read it or I can refer him to Beauchesne if he so wishes. He made a direct aspersion upon the First Minister. — (Interjection) — I believe I am capable of indicating what the matter of privilege is, and I ask the honourable member, without equivocation, without qualification, to withdraw. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not one of those who wants to hold up the process of debate in this House. I am prepared to withdraw the statement if the First Minister feels that what I said that he's playing politics is not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I asked without qualification, without equivocation. I just ask the honourable member to withdraw. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, then, to qualify my position, I will adhere to your wishes and withdraw the statement that the First Minister feels I had no right to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege, I regret very much that the Honourable Member for Rock Lake should make his retraction contingent on my feelings. It's not a matter of my feelings at all, Sir. I say to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake categorically that the fact of the matter is that I did not particularly want this bill, private bill, on the Order Paper. As far as my personal feelings were concerned, I didn't want it on the Order Paper. But the question of introducing a Private Member's bill rests with the private member, and I certainly didn't ask that it be put on this Order Paper, and I ask the Honourable Member for Rock Lake to accept my word for that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I accept the word on the part of the First Minister and I am prepared to withdraw that statement that he . . . Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this, amongst a number of other occasions that I have experienced in this Legislature, when someone on the Opposition stands up to make a comment or express a view or an opinion about any particular part of legislation, and I am now referring to this bill, when it's not music to the ear of the First Minister or any other member of government, they become very, very disturbed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. EINARSON: I want to say, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. My point of privilege is that whether or not something said by the honourable members opposite is something that pleases me or displeases me, is music to my ears or not music to my ears, is immaterial in this case because the point of privilege is simply this: that the — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hardly — you know, I would hardly bother to hear from the Honourable Member from Roblin as to what is or is not a point of privilege, since his experience here is not that long and he is hardly a master of the rules. My point of privilege is simply this: that, regardless of one's feelings on the matter, the simple fact is that I did not ask that this private bill be on the Order Paper; in fact, my personal wish was that it not be. Bearing in mind, however, that a Private Member's bill, the decision as to whether or not it should be filed rests with the private member.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. I should also like to add further, if the honourable member is going to debate, he should not impute motives or infer or make interpretations directly alleging something against another member of this Assembly. We are all honourable

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) members of this Assembly and if it's been stated by a member that he did not, then there should be no further debate or reflection in that manner. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with this particular bill, I want to say, too, that I'm interested in hearing what the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has to say in regards to this Private Members' bill. This is something that has aroused a great deal of interest in more ways than one insofar as the Hutterite people are concerned in the Province of Manitoba and insofar as the people who are not Hutterites. Your municipalities throughout the entire province, Mr. Speaker, are very interested to know just what's going to happen in this Legislature insofar as this bill is concerned, and I feel it is one of real importance because of the way in which this government has handled the situation. Whether the First Minister likes it or not, I feel that I have a right to express my views on this matter as well as any other. That's all I'm doing, is expressing a view. Now if they don't like it, I challenge them, they can stand up and debate. This is the purpose of this Legislature, Sir, and I, Mr. Speaker, have felt in all too many cases, and I've sat here quite patiently on a number of occasions and listened to the honourable members of the government, when they hear some comments from opposition members, if they don't like it they stand up and interrupt, and I, Mr. Speaker, am saying . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. EINARSON: . . . that I think that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of privilege is that the Honourable Member for Rock Lake is now implying that I and my colleagues are objecting to his rising in his place to speak to this bill. Nothing could be further from the truth. But there is a great difference, Sir, between having the honourable member state that I asked that this bill come forward on the Order Paper - which I deny categorically - that it's not the same as my being opposed to his speaking, which is the right of every member of this House, and I don't want it implied that we, or I, am opposed to his rising in his place and speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell at any length on this particular matter but I am reserving my decision as to how I will vote on this when the time comes. I think that a real problem has been created. But there's one thing I would like to ask in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and I'm concerned about the legality of this bill as to how it may affect others in this Province of Manitoba other than the Hutterite people. This, Mr. Speaker, is something that I want made specifically clear to me because I think, Mr. Speaker, it has significance - at least I feel, but I could be wrong, and I just want this matter to be very clear to me insofar as this bill is concerned. Because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement between the municipality and the Hutterite Brethren. Now, just how does this bill affect that agreement and how may it affect others who may be of an incorporated nature, whether it be the Hutterites or whether it be any other corporation, and this is something, Mr. Speaker, that I want to have it made clear by the member who is bringing in this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled to say a word or two in connection with this Private Members' bill. Unlike my honourable friend from Rock Lake, I have been in this Legislature when matters dealing with an agreement, or an alleged agreement, between the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and certain Hutterite colonies was considered. A motion was introduced some years ago by the then Honourable Member for Morris, the late Harry Shewman, and the purport of the bill was to validate agreements entered into by certain of the Hutterite colonies and the executive, then executive, of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, which ostensibly meant that the Hutterites would be curtailed within the Province of Manitoba to establishing colonies within, I believe, a 40-mile radius similar to the Act prevailing in the Province of Alberta.

At that time - and I believe, Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly, it was in around about 1962 or 1964 - strenuous objection was raised at that particular time, and I don't know whether my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake has taken the time out to read the comment that was made at that particular time when the proposition for validation of the agreement that he referred to was made in this House. And at that particular time no accusation was directed at the government of the day that the government was attempting to use its

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) will and its power to impose the proposition raised by way of bill by the then Honourable Member for Morris. And I regret that my friend the Member for Rock Lake this evening has attempted to suggest that the government of today is attempting to impose conditions, and I want to say to my honourable friend that such is not the case and I hope that he accepts my word that such is not the case; that this today, as then, was a Private Members' Resolution or a Private Members' Bill. And just in order that, Mr. Speaker, if I may, while we're dealing with the subject matter of the bill, and that matters pertaining to the Hutterite colony were before us at that time, I want to say for the edification of my honourable friend what happened then to the bills that we were confronted with. They went out of the House and they died, in respect of the agreement or the alleged agreement between the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Hutterite colonies, and the agreement referred to, Mr. Speaker, by my honourable friend was never consummated, it was never binding, it was never legalized; and this House at that particular time, in its wisdom, and I think that it was wisdom, felt and decided in committee that we would not in this Legislature impose any conditions upon the Hutterites of Manitoba similar to those in Alberta.

Now I don't know, I don't know what the disposition of this House will be in respect of the bill that we're considering. This House will decide as to whether or not it agrees with the contention of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. I want to say to my honourable friend, after long discussions not only in the House itself but in committee as well, the honourable members of that Assembly decided that they would not validate an agreement between the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Hutterite colonies because we were convinced then that the Hutterites at that particular time only agreed to the forwarding of the bills for the consideration of this House under duress, and this was clearly established, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time. And how well I remember my former and late colleague, M. A. Gray from North Winnipeg, pleading in this House for the rejection of the very agreement that was referred to a few moments ago by the Member for Rock Lake. And I suggest, I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake that it would be well for him, in order to establish in his mind the propositions that we dealt with at that time, that he should read Hansard that he should consider the disposition of the bills that were introduced and subsequently withdrawn by the then Member for Morris.

We all have our personal opinion as to the conduct, not only of the Hutterite colonies but of the conduct of many other religious bodies and organizations in this province, but it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that some members, present or past and I presume in the future, will endeavour to make much of the conduct of some of our religious assemblies. I've been through it not only in respect of the Hutterites but of other groups, religious groups and professional groups, in the time that I've had the opportunity of serving Manitoba, and I would say, Sir, that with some of the remarks that I've heard tonight, some of us may not be serving Manitoba well with such utterances as we've listened to tonight. And I want to appeal to all honourable members to realize that the bill that we have before us introduced by the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre is his bill. He has introduced it, which is his perfect right. And I also want to appeal to all of the members of this House, as vigorously as I can, that let tolerance prevail in the consideration of the subject matter of the bill, without rancour, but just on the basis of the bill.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain communities in the province of Manitoba that have raised objections - and many objections - as to their suggestion of the expense of the Hutterite colonies in the province of Manitoba. I know that in some municipalities to the west of us here in the capital city of Manitoba, that some of the municipal councils have passed resolution after resolution dealing with the expansion of the Hutterite colonies and the rights and privileges of the individual members of the Hutterite colonies, and that is the subject matter of the bill. But I also want to point out to members of this Assembly who didn't have the opportunity of being in the House as I did, and I believe also the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that the former member for Rockwood-Iberville, Jack McDowell, was one of the biggest opponents to the persecution of the Hutterites in the province of Manitoba, and Jack McDowell, to whom I have referred as the member for Rockwood-Iberville, lived next door, right in between the Hutterite colonies on the Portage Plains, and he accepted them with open arms. And the purport of this bill, of course, is to deal with some of the rights and the privileges of the Hutterites.

Let's go a little further. Let us also consider the contents of this bill and the application

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) to other religious denominations, and this to me is the important principle that we have to consider, not whether it's a government bill introduced by a private member, as suggested by my honourable friend from Rock Lake. Such is not the case, in my opinion. We all have our rights and our privileges in this House. There are many who condemn the communal approach of the Hutterites, but I think more importantly, I think more importantly, Mr. Speaker, those who condemn them are those in this democratic world that we presume to live in that give them the right -- I can't understand the muttering of my honourable friend from Birtle, but I would suggest that if he wants to enter into the debate that it is his privilege as it was my privilege, and I would suggest to my honourable friend, if he has any contribution to make, that he should make it instead of muttering in his seat. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the honourable member have a point of order or a matter of privilege?

MR. GRAHAM: Is the Honourable Minister prepared to yield the floor?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to yield the floor to my honourable friend after I'm finished my rights as a member of this House to a 20-minute contribution, if it is a contribution, to the debate; and I want to say to my honourable friend that if he desires that I yield in order to listen to his normal tripe, the answer is no.

MR. BILTON: No way.

MR. PAULLEY: No way. My honourable friend, the pick and shovel fellow from Swan River, says there is no way, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the former Speaker of this House is so correct when he says, in effect, that there is no way for those of us who have some principles, for those of us who have some principles to penetrate the concrete that's above his shoulders, and maybe -- and maybe, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the reason my honourable friend refers to pick and shovels as against automated equipment is because it's pretty hard for a pick and shovels to penetrate concrete.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we are charged with the responsibility in this House, we are charged with the responsibility in this House of the protection of all minorities, and all minorities should be heard, and the will -- the insurance, they are -- yes, my honourable friend from Roblin there, he worries about him being a minority and, by Jimmy Christmas, he will be a minority at the next vote in the province of Manitoba, so I make that prediction. And my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney, who is one of the most lovable individuals that has ever graced this House, he'll be back as a sole exponent of the minority. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the House to be considerate of the Hutterites in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, would he adjourn the debate? It's 10:00 o'clock.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday).