

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, June 24, 1971

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I would direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 65 members of the Galva Community School Band from Galva, Iowa. These members of the band are under the direction of Mr. Madsen and Mr. Niemeier - I hope I pronounced that name correctly - from the United States.

On behalf of all honourable members I would welcome you here this evening.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 56 (a) (1) The Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this debate on the Minister's Estimates. We share some common interests in our area of Western Manitoba. In addition to our basic interests, we have some special interests in the economy of the southwestern part of Manitoba and in its regional economic development. So, while we have this common interest, it is often my pleasure to share meetings and often to listen to the Minister's speeches on subjects related to his responsibilities in Industry and Commerce, more often than he is subject to any remarks that I might have to make on that. So I was pleased indeed when he began in a way that I have come to expect when he said that he rejects the crude growth economic ideas of the previous Progressive-Conservative Government, and that he adopts the selective growth concept. I felt better right away because, you know, that gets the meeting off to a good start. Everybody feels pretty good. But in these Estimates he also concluded his remarks today with a re-statement of his ideas of the unsuitability of crude economic growth for the sake of jobs alone, and his re-dedication to selective economic activity.

Mr. Chairman, it's a little like at a meeting getting up and singing O Canada to start. You know, everybody feels refreshed and good, and then at the end you sing God Save the Queen, but what takes place between the beginning and the end doesn't necessarily relate to the invocation and the final remarks. So we got off on the traditional foot in this respect, and I've been interested in trying to relate what was given in his explanations to the concept of selective growth. Surely there must be some examples of crude growth for the sake of jobs alone that this government has rejected in the Manitoba economy. Surely there are instances of this, and I was waiting and hoping perhaps that the Minister would explain this more specifically, because I'm not quite sure that I understand how he differentiates in these two philosophies. But no doubt there will be some further explanations as the Minister proceeds.

During the last few months there have been some announcements from the Department of Industry and Commerce and from the Minister, suggesting that the concept of the regional development corporation as it now exists is not quite the way it should be, and that the Department, this government, has some ideas as to changing this, and I get the impression that there's an intention to centralize in some way the operations of regional development corporations. I'm rather anticipating, and it has been indicated, that there might be some legislation which would give us in some greater detail what the proposals are to be in specific terms. If it is to be a centralization and a removal of some of the authority of the directors of the regional programs, then I think we're in a little dangerous ground here in that we may be imposing a single philosophy of government and economic development on the various regional corporations. As they now operate they are largely, as I understand it, autonomous. They reach their own conclusions; they employ the people they feel can best do their jobs; and they are producing, not a pattern of development across the province, but in an individual way and in a decentralized way they are adding to the growth of the regions they represent. I think this is what's happening, but I am somewhat disturbed that this does not meet the specifications of government and I would wonder if the Minister might add to this observations, as he has given them from time to time, in the regions of Western Manitoba particularly, and let us know what he has in mind.

I've also been interested in his studies that he has undertaken in his department and the remarks he has made about the role of Cablevision in Manitoba and in the extension of television services, all of which I think we agree most heartily would be an excellent step - that is, the extension of these services. Now how this should be done specifically is a matter I think that is not entirely resolved. There will be a possibility of perhaps some activity being undertaken by the Provincial Government. If this is to be done, then the rulings of the CRTC would,

(MR. MCGILL, cont'd.) . . . . . I presume, be consulted and would be perhaps modified to permit provincial participation in Cablevision extension in the Province of Manitoba. I think this is an area that is of great interest to all people in the province, and I'm a little surprised that there wasn't some mention of it in the Minister's explanations.

To go now to a more parochial part of the Estimates and one which perhaps interests my constituency and the Minister's more particularly, we chose to mention an example of the public sector and the private sector as working extremely well together and described what has happened in the operations of the A. E. McKenzie Seed Company in Brandon. I have a clipping before me from the Brandon Sun of Saturday, May 9th, in which the Minister is announced as having given the names of his new Board of Directors for A. E. McKenzie Company Limited, and congratulating them and hoping that good things would occur in the operations of the business. And the Chairman's remarks at that time -- rather, the newly-elected Chairman was Mr. Cham, and he said in connection with the taking over of this responsibility: "We'll get together with management; we'll look at any problems that might exist; but there won't be any snap decisions. The policy of this company should be the same as any other. If the talent is available, we should promote from within." This was May 9th.

Now, on December 14th, it was announced by the Minister that McKenzie Seeds had shown a dramatic turn around, that they had produced a modest \$30,000 surplus after a number of years of deficit operations, and I think this is a remarkably good performance because A. E. McKenzie's did have periods when this was not happening, but it did happen for the year ending, I believe, November of 1970. But in the remarks that were made, the Minister said: "Judging from the company's success in the past year, my chief claim to fame may well be my appointment of the company's Board of Directors." Now I would take from that, that the Minister is giving the credit for the performance in the year ending November 1970 to a Board of Directors which took over in May of that year, and I think while they probably had a great deal to do with the operations for that six months, isn't it just a little bit optimistic to suggest that the turn around in the operations and in the success of this seed company was due to the new Board of Directors? I think it would have been quite fair to say that some of the policies were taken two years prior to this decision that resulted in this. For instance, the acquisition of packaging machines, which I understand were acquired in Europe, and this must have been a decision of some two years' standing which produced this result. But McKenzie's have produced a better result and I question whether the Minister is relating the reasons for it quite accurately when he compliments the new Board of Directors on this. Now two years hence, when the results are given in the reports of this, it may well be that this Board of Directors is able to take a responsibility; I don't think Mr. Cham, in his remarks, would indicate that he intended that anything he would do in the first few months of his operation would be this effective.

There is one other area in which I have been quite silent - and found it a little difficult at times to be that way. The Minister has frequently said that the New Democratic Party government of Manitoba has done more for Brandon and southwestern Manitoba in the short time they've been in office than the previous government did in a decade. Now this is just an amazing statement, and I notice now that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has taken up the cry and he is using it as well. Well, I don't think the Minister of Industry and Commerce wants to accept any credit for increases in the economic growth of southwestern Manitoba that are not the particular results of this government's activity, and I'd just like to mention a few of these things which brought the Brandon urban area to a size where it began to grow and to generate growth, in addition to that growth which was brought to it perhaps directly by government.

The Minister, for instance, wouldn't want to take any credit for the new General Hospital at Brandon nor the high rise Nursing Home and Student Nurses' School. There was the Assiniboine Community College which was built at Brandon and it has become an important institute in the area, and I know the Minister doesn't want to suggest that this was the NDP government. There was the Thompson bridge over 18th Street which was built for Highway 10, and I'm sure the Minister of Highways doesn't suggest that the NDP government did that. They are talking about a bridge, but there has been one built by the Progressive Conservative government. They paved Richmond Avenue and they provided \$2,500,000 which stimulated the beginning growth of Brandon University and brought it to the stage which it is now. In addition to the 2.5 million, one million was raised by the citizens of Brandon and this produced the Evans Theatre, one of the first additions - that's the John R. C. Evans Theatre at Brandon University - and the Library Building, the A. E. McKenzie Building. The men's residence and the ladies'

(MR. MCGILL, cont'd.) . . . . residence were built not only with government support but with CMHC funds, a new heating plant at the university, the dining room, the music building. The Western Manitoba Centennial Auditorium was conceived by the previous government - and we appreciate the success and the interest and the additional help that this government is providing for that cultural and very suitable stage for the new things that are coming to Brandon.

The Minister of course agrees that the Manitoba Hydro plant at Brandon was built under previous government auspices and that it has been enlarged once or twice since, and he'd perhaps even admit that the \$30 million agri-chemical Simplot plant was one which was provided by the results and the activities of a regional economic development-conscious Department of Industry and Commerce. Well, there's nothing very crude about what has happened to Brandon with the building up of these agri-chemical industries. Dryden Chemicals have also produced a plant at Brandon. And I would not take the time, Mr. Chairman, to list the number of schools that were built during the period when the Progressive Conservative government inspired that great growth in education that took place in Manitoba in general and Brandon was very specifically included. So all of these things have been rather important to the growth of Brandon and I don't think the Minister really wants to say that what they have done in a year and a half is more than the previous governments did in a decade.

I have just one final remark, Mr. Chairman, and it has to do with the Minister's comments that he rejects the flamboyant, super-salesmanship, expensive, high pressure type of approach that was adopted by the previous government in its Department of Industry and Commerce. He has rejected this flamboyant approach. I recall that when my colleague from Fort Garry was talking about the shortcomings of the program of the department, he mentioned academic redundancy and it was suggested from the other side, by the Minister I believe, that maybe Bud didn't know what the words meant. Well, I'm going to ask the Minister whether he really knows what the word "flamboyant" means, because he has rejected it completely as a concept of the operation of his department. I looked it up in the dictionary, and just in case the Minister doesn't know, I will tell him that it means "marked by wavy, flamelike lines" -- this is flamboyant. It's very difficult to describe this kind of flamboyance. The best way to do it is to perhaps hold up the emblem that has been adopted by the Department of Industry and Commerce which is a sun with flame lines here. This is flamboyance, Mr. Chairman, and under the strict definition the Minister has not rejected it, he's adopted it specifically as the emblem of his department. As to the expensive, high pressure salesmanship, I think it's useful to note that the Minister has taken a full page in Time magazine to explain Manitoba, Canada's No. 1 son. I think this is good; I think this is the way to put the message across; I think it's the flamboyant way with the sun and the wavy red lines.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it should be taken too seriously when the Minister says he rejects the kind of flamboyance that the previous government used in the salesmanship and in promoting the efforts of the department. I don't think it should be taken too seriously what the Minister says in terms of getting jobs for Manitoba between the opening paragraph on the rejection of crude growth for jobs sake and the adoption of selective growth. I ask him to review, if he will, his intentions with regard to regional economic development programs in the province and specifically what he has in mind for the regional development corporations. They are anxious to continue to do their very worthwhile job and I think they're concerned about what the Minister may be intending in the way of changes. These are the few questions which I would put to the Minister, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, after listening to the presentation by two of my colleagues today, namely the Member for Fort Garry and the Member for Brandon West, and particularly after listening to my colleague from Brandon West, he pretty well covered not only from one who is from the city but I think did an excellent job in offering a presentation for somewhat the rural people of the province. I can't help but wonder when I think of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, he is somewhat of a modest individual, but I often wonder how he gets along with his colleagues, particularly the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour whom, insofar as I'm concerned, are two portfolios that are very important insofar as the success of his department is concerned.

To address to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I can't help but wonder, when I think of the comments that the First Minister made when we talk about developing our province, our communities in our province, he referred to that great country called Sweden as a model government. And you know, Mr. Chairman, I

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . . have friends in the City of Winnipeg who happened to be in the country of Sweden last fall at the time of the elections and I have some firsthand information which I think is as authentic as you could possibly get and who are in complete contradiction with the reports that the First Minister of this government has conveyed to the people of Manitoba, namely what he concerned to be a model government. I think the people have seen the errors of their ways over the many years of what socialism has done for that country. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, right, Mr. Chairman. I am one who has broad shoulders. I am one of the Vikings who the First Minister, when I brought to the attention of the Vikings of this country and I mentioned Eric the Red, and of course the First Minister rose to ask me a question. I recall very well what happened to him. I said he's still with us.

I therefore can't help but think of the comments made by my worthy opponent on the other side, the Member for St. Matthews, when he talked about estates and estate taxes as they pertain to those people who made this country, who fought and worked and toiled for maybe 20, 30, 40, 50 years to make this country what it is, and my worthy opponent had the audacity to stand up in this House and say that I think that the estate taxes, which is the hard work of many people over many years, should be completely confiscated when they have seen that the end of the road has come insofar as their services are concerned to our country. This -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I have seen what has happened in this House to some of my colleagues when the honourable members in the government side wished to ask a question. I rather wish to give my speech, Sir, and I will be only too happy to listen to what they have to say. -- (Interjection) -- I'd be delighted to hear the First Minister make a speech on this particular subject, Mr. Chairman.

I was very concerned when I heard my worthy opponent from St. Matthews talk about what should be done with someone who has probably worked many years and toiled to achieve an accomplishment that had taken a long time only to find that we have a government who is prepared to take it completely from him. I feel that this is something that is very important, Mr. Chairman. I want to stress on this particular fact, and I think it relates to the Minister of Industry and Commerce when we talk about those who are responsible for developing this country as we see it and for what it is. I think this, Mr. Chairman, is a very very important subject and I can't help but feel -- and I would like the Minister of Industry and Commerce, as I have invited the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio to come to my constituency, and I say to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I extend the same welcome to him, to come out with me. I wonder whether he has paid a visit to the many business people in the communities, whether it be in the City of Winnipeg, whether it be in the City of Brandon or whether it be in the City of Pilot Mound, such as the Minister of Agriculture saw fit not to visit at one particular time. Because you know, Mr. Chairman, these businesses that the Minister of Industry and Commerce must certainly be most concerned about, if they are to succeed then it's important, because if they don't then those people who those businesses employ, that is the labouring man, have something to be concerned about.

And I take you, Mr. Chairman, to this particular prospect when we talk about the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The First Minister talked about the government and the country of Sweden as a model government and what is done for that country. I suggest to the First Minister, if he'd had sent a junket such as he sent to Sweden, if he'd had sent that group of people to the country of Japan and seen what those people in Japan have accomplished over the past say 15 or 20 years, I think he'd have been doing something and doing a service for the people of Manitoba. Because you know, Mr. Chairman, when you go to the country of Japan, there's a motto there that you find and to me it's very interesting. You talk to the business people, you talk to the labouring people -- and this is where I think that the honourable gentlemen opposite fail to do, they get the one side of the story, but in my opinion if you're going to be successful in anything that you endeavour to do you must have both sides of the story -- and that is when you go to the country of Japan where industry and the working people I think have accomplished more than many countries in this world, and the motto there is, Sir, that the labouring man says: "If the business in which I am employed by is doing well, then it is well for me."

Now the secret of that motto is that I think it's very important that you have a proper relationship -- (Interjection) -- the First Minister is trying to get ahead of me and distract me but that he will not do. The motto here is -- and he is missing the boat completely and I challenge the First Minister on any platform in my area if he so wishes -- the motto there is -- (Interjection) -- yes, I said earlier while the results in the Province of Saskatchewan -- you

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . . know, every dog has his day, there's that saying, Mr. Chairman. Getting back to the country of Japan, I think if we're going to have success in developing industries, in developing a situation where the employee is happy and satisfied in the work which he does, it's important that we have a proper relationship between management and labour.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this is the essence of success, and I can't help but feel that here we have a labour government, or a government that is sort of interested in the labouring people, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Transportation made a visit to Flin Flon this spring at one time I believe - and I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong - and I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that they would have had a great influence insofar as the labouring people were concerned. I've often felt - you know, it used to be at one time, and I'm not being facetiously critical, but I think that to form organizations, unions, what have you, they served a very useful purpose, they certainly have, but I think we have reached the point where we have an economic situation not only in Manitoba but in this country of ours, Canada, that there is a responsibility now on the part of both labour and management, and I would have felt that the First Minister in sending his colleagues would have done something more than what they were able to accomplish, I think to settle, to create an atmosphere by which the problems that were confronting them, both labour and management, but they were not successful in doing so. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, did the two gentlemen that the First Minister sent to Flin Flon, did they consult both sides of the picture? Did they really? I'm wondering about that. This is the area in which I become concerned, Mr. Chairman. This is the area in which I become concerned.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, I become concerned, and I'm wondering if the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- the Manitoba Development Corporation has extended loans to X numbers of organizations, or say corporations or companies. The first one that comes to mind, I'm wondering about the Lord Selkirk Navigation Company. What did it cost the government as far as the purchase on the per dollar value. Was it 10 cents, 20 cents, 30 cents or what have you. -- (Interjection) -- That's all right, that's fine, Mr. Chairman, the loan was made but now we have another government. I accepted my responsibilities when I was in government.

The other area that I want to question, Mr. Chairman, of all the loans that have been made, I don't know how many there are, but I would like to know from the Minister of Industry and Commerce how many loans were made in the Province of Manitoba to date to various companies, and of those total number, how many of those companies does the government have an equity, such as was intended insofar as Versatile was concerned. But you know Versatile, they saw the light, Mr. Robertson saw the light. He saw what was going to happen, and instead of taking on the offer that this government had offered them, he decided that he had better find other ways of getting out of the economic stress that he was in and this is what they did. And unfortunately for them, I say with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, they are much better off today than if they had become involved with the \$6 million that the Provincial Government at the time was prepared to offer them under those conditions. I recall, Mr. Chairman - this was very interesting to me - when I asked the Minister of Mines and Resources insofar as Versatile was concerned - and this is something I think that is very important for the people of Manitoba to know, that under that agreement, if the \$6 million was made available to them they had a deadline to meet insofar as payment was concerned, and I stand to be corrected on this but I believe it was the end of August of that particular year. I remember my question was to the Minister of Mines and Resources, I asked him if by any chance that Versatile were not able to pay that loan back at that deadline and the government took up their option to purchase 25 per cent of the shares - and the other thing was, as I was given to understand, that they would appoint one member on the board - now then supposing, Mr. Chairman, and I presented this to the Minister of Mines and Resources, that if Versatile saw fit to pay that debt off by say the end of December of that year rather than the end of August and the government had exercised their option, in the event that they were able to pay back their debt, would the government then return that equity back to the company concerned. And I recall so well, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines and Resources says, "Oh no, once we have possession of the 25 percent we will maintain it." I believe I am correct on that, Sir. -- (Interjection) -- That's right.

This is something that indicates one thing to me, Mr. Chairman, that while the government pretend to impress upon the people of this province that they're out to help them, I think it's a sort of a back door entrance to taking over industries. I don't know, I fail to understand in the Province of Saskatchewan how - I know the honourable members have got off on a tangent

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . . sometimes - when I think back when they were under a socialist government the number of industries that they took over in that province and when the next election come along they were in such difficulty because the taxpayers were so . . . to them they couldn't drop them quick enough. Now I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Chairman, if you really want to know, the Prime Minister of this country really isn't a Liberal. It's unfortunate - they know the background, I don't have to tell them - and I think basically this is the reason what happened in Saskatchewan if the people really want to know - in my personal opinion - but that is one thing.

I travel around the country, I've travelled and I've visited business places in the City of Winnipeg, I have visited business places in the country, and everywhere I go they're all very concerned. We have an economic situation, I know, but it's not all the responsibility of government, but I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the influence and the environment that is created does have a bearing insofar as to how our economic development will go. The one thing - I don't know whether the Minister of Labour has discussed this with the Minister of Industry and Commerce - you know, when we talk about an increase in the minimum wage, I'm one who feels that anyone who is working is entitled to a standard of living and I think that it should be satisfactory and should be good in such a way that they enjoy the standard of life, enjoy the amenities that this country can provide, but as I have said before, we're not all the same and I think that people seek their own levels and this is where I think the government and I disagree.

So, Mr. Chairman, basically the matters that I have to present to the Minister of Industry and Commerce are the number of industries, and I repeat again, that he has made loans to, and of that number how many do the government have equity in as a result of the amount of money that has been loaned through the Manitoba Development Corporation and really how many jobs have been created in the Province of Manitoba as a result of the monies that have been extended. With those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I will listen to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening before the supper hour and now for 35 to 40 minutes to various comments, questions, criticisms and so on, and I think it's probably very appropriate that I should rise at this time and make a few replies. As a matter of fact I have many comments to make. I could probably take from now until 10 o'clock but I know the rules won't permit it, but let me very briefly attempt to answer some of the major, more serious points that were raised. Some of the points were rather minor and frankly don't merit much comment, if any comment.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion in this province, and particularly in the minds of the honourable members opposite, with respect to the Lake Winnipeg Navigation Company Limited, the company that owns the Lord Selkirk, the vessel know as the Lord Selkirk. The Honourable Member from Assiniboia raised the question just prior to 5:30 and now the Honourable Member from Rock Lake I believe - was it Rock Lake or was it the Honourable Member for Brandon West - made reference to it also and there seems to be a great deal of confusion. Some people seem to think that it is a government corporation, some people have the wrong impression, that a loan was made by the MDC under this administration and they have other misconceptions. These are, Mr. Chairman, without a doubt very serious misconceptions.

The fact of the matter is that the vessel known as the Lord Selkirk was set up where the company known as the Lake Winnipeg Navigation Company Limited received a loan under the Conservative administration, received a loan from the Manitoba Development Fund under the previous administration. And, Mr. Chairman, I want the public of Manitoba to know, and I want the press in particular to know, that the staff of the MDF and the entire board of directors of the MDF were against making the loan to the Winnipeg Navigation because they said it could never be profitable, and the previous government insisted and foisted upon the MDF a loan for the Lord Selkirk. And that's the fact of the matter. Now you're saying the Lord Selkirk it can't pay its way and we're bungling the job and so on. First of all, it's a private company, it always was a private company and it still is a private company. Unfortunately it didn't pay its way and it's gone into voluntary receivership. It's in receivership. And what are we going to do with it? I don't know what the Honourable Member for Assiniboia thinks we should do with it. Give it away to some private enterprise for nothing? Sink it? Ship it to China? I don't know, you know, what are we supposed to do with it? The fact is, Mr. Chairman, and this is the fact, the Company is in receivership and the receiver has put it up for sale. It's

(MR. EVANS, cont'd.) . . . . up for sale under court, under jurisdiction of the court; the Receiver is an officer of the court. In the meantime he is operating it because there is some thought that this can make a contribution to the tourist industry of Manitoba. But let it be clear that that loan was made by the MDF under the previous administration and we've got to solve the problem. We're stuck with that problem. There are a lot of other receiverships that go back to the previous administration's regime that we have got to solve now, and we are doing our best to solve and I think we may be solving it. -- (Interjection) -- I'll prove it, I can prove it . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. EVANS: I'll prove it. What do you want me to prove?

Mr. Chairman, there were a number of other points that were raised, a lot of statistical points made and so on and we could argue back and forth about them. Housing starts were referred to, growth centres and so on, and having worked at a Dominion Bureau of Statistics for a number of years I would be pleased any time to argue statistics with people. I can show that the level of housing starts last year, if you want to talk about that particular series of statistics, were greater last year than the long-term average or the last ten year average.

However, my friend from Brandon West raised a couple of points and I'm sort of going backwards here from the last comments forward, made a point about the Regional Development Corporations and concern about centralization and so on. The fact of the matter is that a number of regional development corporations are suffering financial difficulties, one or two in particular, and it is our concern that we do something to try to strengthen their financial situation. Now we did suggest that this could be done by legislation but I think it could also be done through administrative changes and that may be the course that we will take. But certainly, Mr. Chairman, we are not trying to take away from local initiative or local direction, but at the same time, having said that, in order for the regional development corporations to be effective, they must tie in somewhere along the line with this pattern of growth that we envisage for the province. When we talk about balanced development, the Honourable Member from Assinibola said we should identify growth centres and we should stimulate particular centres and so on, his talking about this whole problem of balanced growth, and I say that it's essential, therefore, that somewhere along the line the regional development corporations be brought in and help us in a very systematic developmental program here.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West referred to television, TV, what are we doing about it, sort of poking fun at me saying I made a few statements, I think that was what he was doing, and saying, you know, what are you going to do about it? Well, I have always stated that I was expressing a personal opinion, but I can tell you that this matter is being very seriously considered by this government, not just by my department but by the entire government. There's a very serious constitutional question at issue here, so much so that the Secretary of State, the Honourable Mr. Pelletier, came to Winnipeg to discuss this matter with the Premier and with other members of cabinet and some of our officials. It's a matter which the Manitoba Development System, for example, has done a great deal of research on in the last several weeks and it's a matter which other civil servants, at our direction, have done a considerable amount of research on in the last few weeks, the last few months.

Again, I would not normally dwell on this because it seems to me that I have dwelled on our accomplishments in Brandon to the point that I really feel that I am repeating myself, but I find myself, Mr. Chairman, forced in a position where I have to remind members of the House that when this government talks about balanced growth and the support of regional centres such as Brandon, it does mean business. The Honourable Member from Brandon West did refer to a number of companies that came to Brandon in the last years of the Conservative administration. He referred to some other public infrastructure. And of course this happened. I'm not taking that away. There it is; the facts are there. Of course, one particular company received an outrageously large loan and is seriously polluting the atmosphere, but we won't talk about that. That was in keeping with the previous government's philosophy of, you know, heads they win and tails we lose. We put up most of the capital and they take the profits, and if it loses who is stuck with the assets but the MDF. At any rate -- (Interjection) -- I'm talking about a policy. I'm talking about a policy . . . -- (Interjection) -- Well they don't want the pollution, I'll tell you that. I tell you they don't want the pollution.

A MEMBER: You're a hypocrite.

MR. EVANS: The honourable member says - well, okay - I'm going around misleading the people in effect. I think this is the impression that, you know, we're spending a lot of

(MR. EVANS, cont'd.) . . . . money in Brandon, trying to build up Brandon, but really the previous government spent just as much if not more. I think that was the gist. I hope I'm not misrepresenting him, I think this was the gist of his argument; and I don't fault him for making the argument, that's what he's I suppose paid for in being the Opposition.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that while previous governments, both Conservative and Liberal have made expenditures in the Brandon area, there has never been in the history of Brandon so much money spent by any provincial government in such a short period of time. And I can document that. Whether you talk about the Keystone Centre, one and a half million dollars; whether you talk about a regional school. You know, a First Street bridge, this has been talked about in Brandon for twenty years or more; you know, twenty years or more. During the campaign I remember the Opposition making a great deal to do about it - in both Brandon East and Brandon West, various candidates making a great deal about, if elected, they would try to do something about the First Street bridge. But the fact is those promises were made for years and years and years. And we think in Winnipeg that the Arlington Bridge is unsafe; you should see the First Street bridge in Brandon. Well I'm pleased, and the Honourable Minister of Public Works and Highways indicated, announced the other day that we are going to have a super replacement, a twentieth century replacement for a nineteenth century bridge.

The lower road to Shilo, you know here's another matter. You know, for years and years and years they talked about paving the lower road to Shilo. We made no promises, but we've done it, it's paved today, and we haven't even been in power two years. Two point four million dollars was the grant, from the regional economic expansion department which this government directed to increase and to improve the sewer and water situation in the City of Brandon. The garage - you know that garage, the garage in Brandon is so bad, has been so bad and so unsafe for years that it's a wonder that somebody hasn't been hurt. It's been condemned how many years ago? - three years ago it was condemned. And we are talking about a period of less than two years; the garage is going up today as honourable members know.

McKenzie Seeds, the honourable member would say, well, you know you only appointed the Board in the spring and the profit situation came out in the fall, so, you know, maybe the new Board shouldn't take all the credit. But I'll tell you this, Mr. Chairman, the previous management was getting it ready to sell and that company was not going to give us a guarantee to keep it in Manitoba let alone Brandon, and we had to reverse that decision. That was the recommendation and it was a policy the president stated; he was hired to get it ready to sell. And he got it ready to sell and it was going to be sold to an American company which would have taken it to Ontario. The fact is that profits were made after years of losses, and these profits were made, a union was allowed in. For the first time in the history of that company was there a union, and there is a union today. And the first time the employees of that company are paid higher than the minimum wage. Never before were they paid higher than the minimum wage in Brandon, and we still made \$27,000 worth of profit. -- (Interjection) -- The fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Someone questioned the hearing of the Chair the other day and I assured the honourable members there was nothing the matter with my hearing. I would ask all honourable members if they wish to enter debate that they stand in the normal way and contribute. The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, in the case of McKenzie Seeds there is such a thing as old time employees, employees who worked there for decades, no pension schemes, very little in the way of benefits. The new management honoured these employees last Christmas -- I'm giving you detail but I'm telling you that we made this profit in spite of all the things that we have done for the employees, in spite of those expenditures there was this profit that was made. Now in case you're . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . not in spite of, because of.

MR. EVANS: Because of. All right. The fact of the matter is that, in case the honourable member is worried that this was an aberration, that the \$27,000 profit was an error, I'm not going to give you the exact figure, but I can tell you that the profit situation when it's reported in the annual statement of that company is going to be substantially greater, substantially greater - and I mean substantially greater. And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, under the new management the company has become the largest package seed company in Canada. It has succeeded Steele Briggs as the number one company. The previous management said "We'll concentrate on Western Canada;" left Steel Briggs to concentrate on Ontario and Quebec.



(MR. EVANS, cont'd.) . . . . Our decision was that we could sell anywhere in Canada successfully, and we are; therefore, we're selling in Loblaw's, we're selling in Steinberg's, we're selling in Woolco and so on. The fact is that it has become the largest seed company of its kind in this country; and it's under this new Board and the new Chairman and the new President of that company; and there have been new people brought in as well.

There is a provincial office building which is about to be constructed. The tenders will be let, I believe, next week. And you know, I remember during the election the people in the Children's Aid Society and other people in Health and Welfare, they were crying out, you know, for accommodation. And finally, within two years here's another thing that we can add to our list of accomplishments.

The Assiniboine Hospital. You know, again, is a replacement for the Assiniboine Hospital which is a personal care hospital. The existing one is a firetrap, and has been a firetrap for many many a year, and it is now going to be replaced and hopefully the construction on it will start this fall.

The fact that we engaged in a provincial employment program. Ask the Mayor of Brandon how many jobs were created under the PEP program. Ask the Mayor of Brandon and the Council of Brandon all the projects that were accomplished in the City of Brandon under that particular program. And I can go on, Mr. Chairman, enumerating many other accomplishments that were done by this government in a very brief period of time. And you can ask, you can take a survey, you can go onto the streets of Brandon and ask the average citizen whether they are satisfied with what this government has done to assist the situation in Brandon, to help Brandon grow, and you'll find that they're unanimous in their decision, that this government, the Schreyer administration, has done more for the City of Brandon and area than any other government in the history of this province. In fact, you can even ask the Mayor that and he'll tell you. But let me go on because I don't really want to dwell on this, Mr. Chairman, I really didn't want to talk about any particular region but I was prompted to do so by my honourable friend from Brandon West.

Let me go on and answer some of the questions that were raised by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry. You know, he questions the matter of exodus of people from the Province of Manitoba. Well the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there is a rural-urban shift going on all over North America, and although there is this shift the Province of Manitoba did increase in population by 4,000 people in the past year, whereas the Province of Saskatchewan did decrease in absolute terms by 18,000 people. Now there are different reasons for this. You know, I say we have a 4,000 increase in Manitoba and you say, well that's very moderate and it really doesn't mean anything. But let me tell you this, that the cities and the major towns of this province are growing rather rapidly. The City of Dauphin, or the Town of Dauphin, is growing rapidly. The City of Thompson, in fact it's growing so fast we can't keep up with the statistics; we don't even know how many people there are in Thompson, it's growing so fast. And the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman, the City of Winnipeg last year increased by a population of close to 12,000 people, it increased by a population of almost the size of the City of Portage la Prairie. You know, it's just like taking a town or a city the size of Portage la Prairie and adding it to Metro Winnipeg, and that is the extent of population increase that occurred here, and the fact is that there is population increases that are going on in the selected growth centres of this province.

And I would say, too, that in spite of all the gloom and doom - you know, when this party was in opposition we were criticized severely for referring to any population loss or referring to any companies that folded or wanted to move out because we were destroying what the then government was trying to do in creating economic development, but it seems to be all right now for us to receive all this doom and gloom from the opposition and I don't fault them, I don't fault them for doing it, but, you know, it seems that they have changed their position on it very substantially and very sharply. The fact is that there are a number of companies that there was some thought that they may move, but the fact is that they haven't because - and there's the very simple fact that they have not moved out of this province, in fact they've expanded or are expanding in this province - and it's simply because they can make good profits here and it does make sense for them to be located in Manitoba.

Somebody mentioned Versatile, here's a good example. Versatile is here today, Versatile is growing today. You know, you talk about the gut issues and talking to businessmen. Well, I've talked to the people who run Versatile and I've sat down and I've had lunch with them

(MR. EVANS, cont'd.) . . . . and I've met them on many occasions and we've talked about a lot of things that we can do to help Versatile grow. Likewise with Motor Coach Industries Limited. You know, the Free Press was telling us that they were just at the drop of the hat going to leave Winnipeg. The fact of the matter is Motor Coach Industries is expanding. In the last three or four months they've added at least 200 people to their staff and I think in their two plants they employ about 1,000 and perhaps more people. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that this story that people are leaving, that companies are leaving, it just doesn't wash.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry mentioned that we had a climate of depression, a climate of anxiety, and I'd like to ask him why, if that is the case, why do we have a climate of depression or anxiety. I'm not sure whether that is the case because Manitoba has the lowest, about the lowest level of unemployment of any province in this country. And, Mr. Chairman, I can assure members of this House that I've talked to hundreds of businessmen, hundreds of professionals, yes and even many academics as well about the economic situation in this province over the past few years, and I'll tell you they're pretty well unanimous in saying that if we are in economic difficulties in Manitoba in the west this year it is because of Federal Government policies, a deliberate attempt on the part of the Trudeau government to create unemployment, and the Prime Minister said so himself. He was going to have the guts to put people out of work if that's what was needed to create an anti-inflation atmosphere, if this is what was needed to . . .

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable 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.

. . . . Continued on next page

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, my remarks in dealing with this bill will be very brief. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of the last session and between this one that we would have had some recommendation from the Committee on Professional Associations dealing with this matter as it was referred to this committee for study in between sessions. Unfortunately, however, we haven't had any recommendation from the committee, and I feel that the whole matter of granting and conferring of titles by the Legislature is one that needs thorough review; and now since this does not seem to be possible, because this issue has been kicking around, I feel that there has been a proliferation of the granting of the title "doctor" not only in professional fields but in some non-professional fields. It's almost got to the point where five men -- or where there was a large gathering of people and someone took ill and someone called "Is there a doctor in the House," five people came forward, and when they were asked if they were a doctor of medicine one said no, I'm a doctor of philosophy; another said no, I'm a doctor of education; another was a doctor of theology; one was a chiropractor, he has the title of doctor; God knows what the other, but the poor man who was suffering from the illness didn't have a doctor of medical science available and he died. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the field of medicine is one that the general public recognizes that the title of doctor is a doctor of medicine.

Therefore at this time, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill because I have no faith that in the next session or between this session and the next session that any recommendation will come forward. Until the time that this Legislature is prepared to take a serious review dealing with the whole field of professional associations, I am in the position, Mr. Speaker, seeing that there is no solution at the present time, and unfortunately I'm going to have to vote against this bill which has been going on and I think it should die where it is right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to speak at length on this bill. I would like however to make a few remarks that might have been made before. Should it sound a bit repetitious, I hope I'll be forgiven because my reason for repeating some of the statements previously made is simply that I think they are worth underlining.

We have right now a group of people in our society who are charged with the responsibility of seeing that our people have someone to turn to when they have some difficulty, some disease, some deflection of some kind with their eyes, a very vital organ. Those people are the ophthalmologists, the optometrists and the opticians. There's only three groups of people, and those three groups, like the Member from St. Vital so ably mentioned previously, are charged with different responsibilities, and my purpose in speaking here today is simply to be real sure that the members of this House fully understand those categories, those responsibilities and the consequences of mixing those up.

First of all, there is only one that suitably can be called a doctor. He is first of all a doctor of medicine in his own right, and whether he goes any further or not in post graduate work he is already a doctor; and he chooses after having his Doctor of Medicine to go on to post graduate work and become an eye specialist and this fellow, Mr. Speaker, is called an ophthalmologist and then nothing else. There is only one real category that I think ought to be called a doctor. I don't want to elaborate, but the doctor qualifies to do work such as surgery; work such as including drug treatment; work including the other works performed, especially by the optometrists, that of refraction. Working with the eye specialist in the same way, Mr. Speaker, as you have pharmacists working with the medical doctor, in the very same way you have the optician who is responsible to fill the prescription that is ordered by the ophthalmologist. Those two groups of people work as a team. There is no question of the optician doing work with a patient because this group works as a team.

Now the people who call themselves optometrists, as I understand, are the group of people in between those two or in between that team, and I'm not saying for one moment that they should not exist nor am I discrediting them in any way, but I would like to have it clearly understood that their function is different from either one of the two others. What they do mainly is specialize in the area of refraction, as the Member from St. Vital so ably mentioned. That is the only area they can work in. Coupled with that, they are privileged in that they are able to sell glasses in the same way as the optician is able to do.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.)

Now what happens when you have these three groups of people. In my view, Mr. Speaker, what you have is a little bit of confusion and what this bill would provide is a great deal more confusion for the people of Manitoba. What you have now, whether we like it or not, is people visiting the optometrist thinking they are visiting a specialist, and that, Mr. Speaker, I think is a disservice in terms of services provided to our community. I don't say for a moment that people of Manitoba should not visit the optometrist, but I say that they should know that they are visiting an optometrist and not an ophthalmologist.

I have practical experience in this area and one that I must admit is maybe a little regrettable. I was principal of a school at one time when a teacher referred to me a large number of students, and by large I mean some 15 students, whom she suspected of having difficulty because of an inability to see properly for one reason or another, and of course this teacher could not diagnose any better than anyone else but she could detect that maybe there was a problem and a problem worth considering. In the final analysis what happened, these people, these students were referred to an optometrist who happened to be visiting those towns at a particular time. I don't know the exact statistics, but I'd be prepared to say that well more than half of those students of the group who saw the optometrist came back wearing glasses, and I have the impression, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think I'd be dissuaded from that impression, that very frequently what happens is those very students, thinking they had seen a doctor, a specialist, convinced that they needed glasses came back with a pair of glasses and a \$30.00 bill. I suggest that that was a disservice to those very students because they did not get the proper kind of evaluation in all cases.

What this bill does is provide a little more confusion, because those students only thought they had seen a doctor and if we pass this bill they'll be right, they will have seen a doctor all right but they will not have seen a specialist, and I cannot see how people who are informed on this subject in this House, in spite of having seen it done in other jurisdictions and namely the United States, can support this bill; and if they do, I think that if we do we ought to bear some of the responsibility when we know that some of our constituents are going to see someone whom they think is a specialist but happens to be an optometrist.

I'd like to bring just one other point into focus here, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I happen to be ultra-conservative, but I feel that in our society if we want to value, if we want to value the degree of a doctor, that we ought to attach some value to it. For practical reasons I can only see a medical man being really called a doctor, and to me in my own way of thinking a doctor is still a medical specialist, and I'm a little taken back to having doctors of education and doctors of theology and doctors of philosophy and all the other doctors, in spite of my great admiration for those people, Mr. Speaker, I'm still not convinced that it is the best thing to encourage.

I suggest therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we treat this matter very carefully, that we don't further confuse the issue and that we respect a little those who earn their doctor's degree the hard way. I would like to see our status of doctor retained, and I would hate to see the day when you can get a doctor's degree with little effort, maybe even only dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, it certainly does seem repetitious to be debating the subject matter of Bill 21 again. Apparently this bill is reintroduced almost annually in the hope that the same people who discussed it the previous year and did not give it approval might somehow have changed their minds. The tactic is something like the proverbial water dripping on stones, and the assumption is that eventually we will be worn down. I think we should be thankful that not all associations adopt the same tactics, because if they did our workload would be insurmountable.

Mr. Speaker, one of my objections to this bill is that the use of the title doctor by optometrists may confuse and mislead the public as to the quality of care that they would be receiving. It's very difficult for the average person to sort out the difference between an ophthalmologist who is a medical doctor, an optometrist who is trained to examine eyes and to measure them for glasses, and an optician who prepares glasses according to a doctor's prescription. There are of course some people who find an even easier way out by simply going to the five and dime store and trying on the glasses in the pile until they find a pair that suits them reasonably well and this is not entirely uncommon.

A second objection is my reluctance to see the Legislature begin a practice of granting

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) . . . . degrees. A degree should recognize academic and technical competence and should never be degraded by the Kentucky Colonel sort of approach, a granting of honours by government. The Ontario Committee on the Healing Arts conducted a comprehensive study of health services and reported to the Ontario government in 1970. The committee in Recommendation 129 on Page 30 stated that optometrists should continue to be prohibited by law from using the title doctor with or without qualifications. Now this is in spite of the fact that the Ontario College of Optometry grants a degree, a doctor's degree, a Doctor of Optometry degree. Their concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the public might be misled as to the qualifications and the identity of the practitioner that they choose.

In Quebec, in 1971, a commission on enquiry into health and social welfare, in presenting its report dealt with terminology and titles. This is on Page 44 of Volume 7 which deals with the professions in society. I would like to read from it. "There is also reason to regulate the use of certain titles and, in particular, that of doctors. The title of doctor in our milieu generally suggests a physician and the public usually attaches to it a mainly medical significance. He who says "doctor" means physician. It is obviously to benefit from the prestige surrounding the title that other professions seek it to dress up their members. It is known, for example, that chiropractors and optometrists often call themselves doctors. The situation creates a malaise and causes confusion in the public mind. We therefore propose that the title of doctor without qualitative distinction be limited to physicians who are members in good standing of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the Province of Quebec."

Mr. Speaker, the optometrist is an unusual type of practitioner who examines the eye, measures the sight, prescribes glasses and then fills the prescription. Now this arrangement calls for unusual integrity in order to protect the public. We have all observed public reaction to medical doctors who might have a financial interest in drug stores. This is considered quite unethical practice. The optometrist, I think, wants the best of all worlds. He wants the prestige and status that goes with the title of doctor and the advantage of sending himself the business that keeps his retail shop flourishing.

A minority opinion was appended to the Ontario report of the Committee on the Healing Arts. This minority opinion was by the Chairman, Mr. I.R.G. . . . I would like to read you a part of that opinion which describes the advantages that he would gain over opticians who are also providing glasses, and his business advantages. "The optometrist proposes to charge all his expenses and overhead, including those of his retail premises, to his professional taxes, and by charging no mark-up on the lenses and frames, to appear to be conducting his retail establishment as a cost-free service to the public. To do this he has established a schedule of fees which, we are told, permits him to charge for such items as examinations, refraction prescription and dispensing, total fees in excess of those normally charged by ophthalmologists. If the objective of professionalizing the practice of optometry and limiting overt prescriptions are of great importance, they could more surely be obtained by a complete divorcement of the professional practice from the retail operation, but I do not believe that this would be in the public interest because, as we have shown, the optometrists are providing this very public service. By the same token, the ophthalmic dispenser is performing a necessary public service and it is not in the public interest that he should be deprived, by competitive pressures, from making a fair return on his business. It seems to me that the effect of this recommendation might well be to limit his ability to do so." Now that represents the situation in Ontario.

The added advantage which the optometrist wishes to have might well squeeze the optician who is also doing work of good quality out of business and would handicap him in trying to earn a proper living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted the Ontario and the Quebec special reports. I think we can benefit from the extensive thought and study on which their recommendations are based, and perhaps then we could settle this question once and for all.

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

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): I move, seconded by the Member from Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I took the liberty of phoning the member over the supper hour and he suggested that if anybody wished to speak, and if this House thinks it's all right, I

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . . would like to make a small contribution at this time.  
(Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Apparently, Mr. Speaker, one of the great athletes of Manitoba has fallen down in the baseball track yesterday and this is why the honourable member is not present today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words concerning this bill. This bill is one that I feel I must say something to it. Perhaps I feel overly strong about it, and I wish to say at the outset that whatever I have to say about the bill or may mention as we go along, I hope the Member for Winnipeg Centre does not think that I am trying to get personal or what have you because that will be not the intention at all. In fact for a while when I started reading the bill I wasn't quite sure that if perhaps there was more than one basic principle involved, but I have come to the conclusion that he definitely is referring to the Hutterite colonies, or the communal colonies of the Hutterites and not necessarily of other communals. -- (Interjection) -- No, I wasn't referring to Mennonites, I was referring to other communals and I don't think it's necessary to mention them at this time because it's not in the bill; they're referring definitely to the Hutterite colonies.

Mr. Speaker, I have great difficulty in trying to figure out why the Member for Winnipeg Centre would wish to bring in a bill like Bill 44. He states in his short remarks that his one concern, or one of the reasons why perhaps he came to thinking of it was the fact that one of our Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of Canada had suggested that certain aspects of holding property should be looked into. Well I can understand that one, but his second reason is rather unclear to me. Unless he is absolutely convinced that he wants to make it clear that he believes if one of the members, for example in this case of the Hutterite colonies, should leave for reasons that are not mentioned, and we don't need to know, that they should be given full compensation, or at least given part of the equity accrued while they were living in the community.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we would want to meddle or interfere with certain ideals or policies of life, as I think happens to be the case in this respect. Perhaps to a great extent I could agree with the Member for Winnipeg Centre as far as certain problems of economic or materialistic conditions were concerned, but that is not in the Bill, we are not referring to how much land they could possess or how close they live together - and there are surprising figures in this respect. I don't wish to really go into that because this is not what the bill calls for, but I read part of the hearings of 1947 when it was established at that time that the average Hutterite owned only 26 acres of land, or 26 acres per person, where other farmers owned an average of 67 acres per person. Of course this may have changed since 1947, but I think the proportion would have perhaps gone up with the Hutterites but also with the other farmers, and I think the proportion would be very much the same.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I find it very hard why the honourable member would bother bringing in a bill like this, especially if he had taken the trouble of reading up some of the problems that have taken place in the past between governments and between these people, and I am very sincere when I say that these Hutterites live like they do for a reason, and that reason is strictly a religious issue. I am not referring to the Member for Winnipeg Centre when I am going to suggest that sometimes I wonder if all the problems people say are created by the Hutterites are not really exaggerated. I wish to name a few, or say a few things about these Hutterites. I perhaps left out when I talked of communals before that there are quite a few perhaps even represented in this House, but I won't go to the personal nature. If the honourable member wishes me to expound on that I shall later.

Mr. Speaker, during the hearings and during the time of the briefs of 1947 there were certain things that were clearly established as far as the Hutterites were concerned and I wish to name a few.

The Hutterites believe in communal living or colony life and ownership in common. All property is owned in common, and I wish this down for the record because I think that most of you know quite a bit about the Hutterites, and I can also say that while I have represented them over the years, right now in my present constituency there are no Hutterites so I am not speaking politic in this case. No Hutterite member is the sole owner of any property. This is clear as we see in Bill 44. Also, the Hutterite land is assessed and Hutterite land is taxed on the same basis as other farm land is in any municipality. They pay all the municipal, they pay

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . . the school district taxes which may be levied against their buildings and levied against their land, and for income tax purposes each colony is classed as a corporation. I point these things out to you because I feel that at times there have been statements made that are really not too clear, and I am just going to mention a few more things and then I shall try and get back on something else.

Also, the Hutterites, at that time it was established that the Hutterites paid for the upkeep of their private schools - and at that time they had four in number, I don't know what they have now - in addition to the regular school district taxes. Now, I could say at this time that we have over 30 Hutterite colonies in Manitoba at this time. There are approximately 15,000 Hutterites across Canada and of course Alberta has more colonies than any of the others.

Also, I would like to point out the Hutterite's care for the welfare of all persons in the colony. I don't think the Minister of Health and Social Development has too much trouble with these people in this respect, and that includes the aged, the sick, the unemployed. They are all provided by their own assistance. They do not accept, in most cases, Old Age Pensions. For a long time they did not accept Mothers Allowance. They do, some of them do now but not too many, and I think we can all agree that any of the people that know the Hutterites, that perhaps they are known - I certainly agree - they are a peaceful, industrious, law-abiding people, and I think the Attorney-General would bear me out when I say that very seldom do they find these people in the courts of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would just point this out because I believe in this case the bill is slanted at a group - and not personally again I say for the Member for Winnipeg Centre - slanted to a group that believes in this type of life, not just for the sake of living economically or otherwise, but are very sincere and dedicated and this is their way of a religious life.

Another point I would like to bring out, and I guess by now members must know that I cannot vote for this bill, I was wondering if the Member for Winnipeg Centre would be good enough to tell this House when he closes debate, was he perhaps asked by a Hutterite to bring forth this bill or was he perhaps asked by one that has left the colony and perhaps there may be a few sour grapes, I don't know. In any case, my main point that I wish to point out is that they are not just sincere about it, this is their way of religion.

Quite often the point has been brought up, and perhaps I should mention it at this time, at the time of their baptism this is one of the questions that these members are asked, if they agree to share the property, if they agree that they will have no comeback on that property. This is one of the questions asked at their baptism, and a lot seem to think that perhaps they are baptizing their children at nine or ten or twelve, but generally speaking, you can check this out, they will not baptize before they are 18, and while perhaps this was a little bit young a couple of years ago, I think now with the age of majority being 18 I think we'll have to buy that and say they should be mature. But to doublecheck on that, very often at 21 they again talk with this member and re-confirm if he really wishes to be a member of that colony. So I think that these things should be pointed out.

Another thing that I'd like to point out, a person living in a colony does not have to be a member of that colony to receive clothing or food or shelter. He can do everything any other member does except he cannot vote. As you know, the men have the vote and make certain decisions, but this person can live in the colony all his life, having all the privileges except the vote. I thought this was important because - and this is why I am pointing it out.

Even one other thing I wish to point out that I'm sure that most of the members -- (Interjection) -- I hope you will hear about it. The other thing that most of us might even think more of, they actually believe and they have a right to believe if this is their religion, that if they are giving something they name it, they say if they give something to the Lord today, how can you take it back tomorrow, and there's a merit in this thinking, this is their belief and this is one of the reasons why they're so very disturbed about this bill, because again it is not for economic or materialistic reasons, this is their way of religion not just their way of life, and it really isn't that simple. Some of us could say, well this person is leaving the colony, give him what he deserves, give him his share, but that's not really the way it works. The average number in a colony in Manitoba I understand is around 120. Well of these 120 you can say that 99 percent of them are married in most cases and less the children, so it boils down to about 30 males or so, and if three or four or five should decide to leave you're doing another thing, you're tearing up a community by allowing certain amounts of money for those that wish to go out, you're interfering with the present setup that exists before they decide to leave that colony.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, I'm really concerned and I'd like to ask ourselves that we as legislators take this upon ourselves and wish to make a change where it affects a people that do this for the sake of religion. They're not just living this way because it's a way of life, but more important I think, I reiterate, it is their belief, their religion, and the two combined happens to be their total way of life. It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, to scare people with materialistic things or economically but I think it's much worse to challenge or to disturb, and if I may use the word "scare" people that they will not be able to use their religious rights or to live their way of religion the way they would really like to.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about a Bill of Rights; we talk about hanging on to our freedom of religion and many other virtuous ideals. I think we're not really sincere if we do not in this case also consider the freedom of religion that these people would so much wish to have; and my main reason, Mr. Speaker, for objecting to this bill all centres around the principle of freedom of religion. As I said at the start, if economic or materialist conditions could be changed without affecting the sole religious belief of these people, I think I could quite easily take a different attitude than I do at the present.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that something happens to this bill, that when these people come in and present themselves I hope, I'm sure they'll be given a fair chance. I know this is the intention of the Member for Winnipeg Centre and everyone concerned in this House but I hope they will be given a fair opportunity to voice their opinion because they are disturbed about this matter and they would like very much that we should try and help clear this matter up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this important bill. I think my views are fairly well-known on the Hutterites. On this rare occasion I would like to say that I agree almost 100 percent with the remarks of the Member from La Verendrye. I say 'almost' because I look at it from a religious point of view and I look at it from a point of view of what is right and what is just and it's a question - although I believe that we should all try and live by the ten commandments, God gave us a brain and a heart, nevertheless I don't think it's up to me to force people and to tell them you must live a certain way religiously - but I think that there is another issue here that's important from a legislator's point of view, and that is what is economic justice.

We have in the bill an age inserted, eighteen years old. Well you know, Mr. Speaker, that when a child is 18 years he's just barely got dry behind the ears, you've finished feeding and educating him and he's just ready to start working for his bread and butter, and according to the bill as I read it, maybe I read it wrong, he is to get his share whatever, if there's 50 people I presume he'd get 1/50th share. Another person who's spent a lifetime, say 65 years; he has devoted his entire life to working and building up that colony and according to that bill he is entitled to the same proportion of that colony as that kid who hasn't done anything to build up the assets of that colony. That seems to me - aside from all the religious considerations - that seems to me would be a terrible injustice for that man who has spent a lifetime and maybe he wants to retire and take it easy; maybe he wants to leave the province and join his brethren down south of the line, and he would get the same type of thing for a lifetime of toil as the 18-year old who decides that, you know, the life is maybe too square, too dull for him on a colony.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Member for La Verendrye in expressing the same reservations and I hope that the sponsor of this bill can answer some of the very serious questions that have been raised in this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Transportation and the Honourable Member for La Verendrye in speaking in opposition to this bill. I think that a brief review of the history of the Hutterite movement, starting in the 15th century in central Europe following it through to the persecutions and the hardships and the many difficulties that this group of people have gone through generation from generation from central Europe to Russia, then finally on their immigration to North America, we can trace a long history in which there has been discrimination, resentment and undue legislation insofar as this particular group of people are concerned because of differences of view that the majority have with the minority.

The Honourable Member from La Verendrye mentioned the fact that upon baptism the Hutterites agree to a particular vow of poverty. I have the words here of that vow; they're



(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) . . . . very clear as to the young person upon reaching 18 as to his responsibility. I would just very quickly like to read those words into the record. They are as follows: "This we plainly state to everyone beforehand so that we may be under no obligation to return anything to anyone afterwards. Therefore, if anyone should undertake to join us and later feel it impossible to remain and wish to have anything returned, let him now remain away, keep his own and leave us in peace. We are not anxious for money and possessions but desire only Godly hearts." This is the vow that is taken by the Hutterite upon his baptism at the age of 18; probably not too dissimilar to the type of vows of poverty that other religious groups, monastic orders and in the convents accept upon their being enrolled into those various groups. I do not think though this bill is, as the Honourable Member for La Verendrye inferred, rather vague on this point that we can suggest with clarity that this bill is aimed directly only at the Hutterite people; if it is then I suggest it is discriminatory against these people as against those other religious groups too that practice vows of poverty.

I would simply like to - and I dislike doing this very much, Mr. Speaker, it's very rare that I should do this, is quote from an editorial of the Free Press of all things of May 25, 1971. However, I do think that this editorial sums up the position that ought to be taken in this House in reference to an editorial that was printed in that same paper some ten years ago. It reads: "Nor can the government be accused of not doing the right thing. Ten years ago in these columns it was said, "if merely because they do not approve of some aspects of Hutterite living, our legislators are prepared to impose statutory restrictions on them, are they also prepared to impose the same kind of restrictions on all other religious groups and communities, or, for that matter on all other Manitobans. There should be no restrictions of any sort upon the Hutterites that do not apply to every other citizen or religious community." I suggest that that of course is very true today, whether it relates to this particular legislation proposed or to the type of legislation that the Leader of the Liberal group appeared to support which would impose some restriction upon the expansion of Hutterite colonies within municipalities within the province. I think all these forms of restrictiveness insofar as the colonies and one's latent freedom to adopt and to practice the religion of one's choice are harmful within a free society and that measures such as this should be defeated in the House.

In conclusion there is an early court case involving some disagreement that occurred many years ago, decades ago in the Lutheran Church when the Unitarian followers within the Lutheran Church decided that they would depart from that church and in some instances congregations of the Icelandic Lutheran Church were petitioned against by members of that church in order that the assets of the church should be distributed to the Unitarians. I know the Honourable Member for Wellington's position in this respect, but I would like to read into the record, too, some words from that early judgment which I do feel adopts very well the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the principle that we wish to attempt to establish today. The judgment read: "A guarantee of religious freedom has nothing to do with the property. It does not guarantee freedom to steal churches. It secures to individuals the right of withdrawing, forming a new society with such creed and government as they please, raising from their own means another fund, building another house of worship, but it does not confer upon them the right of taking the property consecrated to other uses by those who may now be sleeping in their graves. The law of intellectual and spiritual life is not the higher law but must yield to the law of the land." That's an early case involving the Lutheran and the Unitarian Church and I think that the same principle is certainly no less true in the case before us. The Hutterite colonies are a church in themselves; their economic and social life is in fact a church and that the passage of any such legislation as this, I think, personally would contribute to an infringement upon that religious belief.

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

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my opposition to Bill 44 and join with my fellow colleagues from Thompson and Selkirk, and I also want to congratulate the Member from La Verendrye for so eloquently putting forth his opposition to this resolution. I also believe that the communal colonies of the Hutterites are an internal matter, it's a religious matter, I have on numerous occasions had dealings with these people in the past several years, and I derive a sense of security when I drive into the yard of the Hutterite Colony. There is a feeling of utmost security when you drive into such a place and I'm happy to have the information that even someone who is not a member could some day go there and

(MR. ADAM cont'd.) . . . . . be cared for if he has nowhere else to go. For the record, I want to say that I oppose this resolution most emphatically.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to oppose the legislation and I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can do it in as gentlemanly way as the previous speakers have and you must realize that I'm going to have to control myself to do this because I do think very little of this kind of garbage legislation. I think it's unthinkable, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of bill should have been introduced in the first place and I do not for one moment blame the Member for Winnipeg Centre. I would like to suggest that maybe it is legislation that is not properly screened by the front benches. Maybe the Premier is lacking responsibility in supervising what kind of . . .

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, point of privilege. Normally, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't take the Honourable Member for Emerson that seriously but he has made reference to my failure to exercise my responsibility and I would simply point out that this is a Private Members' bill, pure and simple, and that this is not a dictatorship and a private member has the right under centuries of tradition of Parliament to introduce any legislation he pleases.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable First Minister. -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. I should like to indicate on the question of privilege which was raised, that the point is well taken. I thank the Honourable First Minister. I was on the verge of rising myself. I would indicate for the Honourable Member for Emerson that he stay within the bounds of decorum and debate while he's debating this resolution. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your admonition and I must also thank the Premier for clarifying the point that he really had absolutely nothing to do with this legislation and therefore the responsibility must rest with that of the member who introduced it.

As we look through this bill, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves one question I think

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm going to indicate to all members that Rule 40 still applies and if any member wishes that I should get a little more severe about it, I can certainly entertain that. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: As we consider the bill, I think one must ask himself - and that is not true only of this bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order? Point of privilege?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with the greatest respect, I draw the attention to a contravention of Rule 24(2) by the honourable member opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member referring to 24(2)? I wish he would elucidate. At the moment I can't seem to find it.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to read Rule 24(2): "No member shall read any newspaper in the House."

MR. SPEAKER: That's not 24(2) that I can find. The honourable member is correct, but the Rule No. is 42; it's a misprint in our rules. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'm going to have to start at the same place as I was in my notes, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that when a member considers the material included in a bill, regardless of which bill it is, I think he must also consider what motivates someone to bring this kind of bill forward and what motivates someone to support it or fight against it and so on, and I humbly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the motivation behind this particular bill is really to attempt to disrupt the kind of living that has been going on for many years, that of the colony-type living experienced by the Hutterites.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate to the honourable member he's getting on some very thin ice in imputing motives to others and our rules do not allow that. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'm going to start a little further down in my notes, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that anyone who fully understands the way of life, the objectives, the sense of values, the kind of people that make up the Hutterite colonies, could not support this bill, and I suggest to you that . . .

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. GIRARD: Certainly.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would agree that an apt description of the manner of economic living of the Hutterites could be compared to pure socialism.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I agree, Mr. Speaker, fully. I would say communism and not socialism. That's what 's good about the Hutterites - you know, they're not half way, they're all the way; and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what's best is that we know where they stand. The real objection to this communistic way of life, the real objection of the society we are used to to this communistic way of life is that we don't really understand their sense of values, and I suggest to you that for somebody who has lived in St. Eustache, who has been surrounded by three colonies on one side and two on the other, lived with them, had people who had left the colony work and live and sleep and eat and partake of your home, you get to realize what motivates these people, what their sense of value is, and I suggest it's not a laughing matter when I say that you can learn to appreciate those very people if you know them well enough.

I'll go one step further, Mr. Speaker, I'll suggest to you that when we deal with people of Indian ancestry we face exactly the same problems. We have statements made even in this House by well-meaning people who think they understand those people, but I suggest to you that not all of us clearly understands the Indian with his sense of values, his way of life, his objectives and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I hope because of the late hour you'll see fit to overlook my Member from Riel in his disruptions and we'll be able to carry on.

What this bill really does, Mr. Speaker, is disrupt the family group that exists in that particular colony. I want to underline the problem raised by the Honourable Minister of Highways. He's absolutely right, that the fellow 65, the fellow 18 get the same kind of assets. But what's even worse, Mr. Speaker, those assets are evaluated, according to the bill, by some outside group I would suppose, because the bill doesn't set out who's going to determine what the assets are. I suggest to you that those assets can be flexible depending on assessment, and so the bill in practice is an unworkable thing anyway.

I'd like to give it a few other bumps, Mr. Speaker, if I may, because I do feel very strongly on this particular issue. I feel that if we pass this bill we ought also to be able to vote for a bill that would say to a parent of a family, if your son leaves thou shalt pay him a portion of your assets and the portion we'll decide because we'll be able to evaluate it ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.