

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, April 10, 1964

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XV - Administration.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister a question before he answers all the other questions he received this afternoon. He said yesterday the Children's Aid Society has four districts in the Greater Winnipeg area but Assiniboia, and I think that he mentioned St. Charles, do not belong to any of these districts and they come directly under the Department of Welfare. Could he indicate if this will be -- I don't know if I should say rectified, or will it be changed soon so that the people of Assiniboia will be served by either one of the districts or is there talk of creating or setting up another district to serve the rest of the Greater Winnipeg area such as Assiniboia, and Charleswood.

MR. CARROLL: . . . . comment on what I said last night. Assiniboia and Charleswood have been part of what we call our Central-interlake agency. It's not part of one of the Children's Aid Societies that we have in Manitoba. It lies outside of the boundaries and I indicated the other day that we have had some discussions, only with the department and not with the agencies, about the possibility of maybe having a look at our boundaries to see whether there might not be some value in rearranging the boundaries to get better service from the agency than we may be getting -- better co-ordination.

These boundaries have been in existence for some time and as you know conditions have changed very substantially, particularly during the last three or four years out in that Charleswood-Assiniboia area where we've had a tremendous growth of population, and particularly among the young married couples who are really excellent prospects for adoption homes, and I would hope that maybe there might be some adjustment in boundaries to enable us to serve that area better.

This is part of the problem of urbanization, one of the growing changes that have taken place and sneaked up on us possibly a little faster than our services were prepared to meet the problem, and as I indicated earlier we do have a crash program which will be under way during the coming summer months. It will be operated by people who are university graduates with at least one year's experience in social work, under very close supervision of trained and experienced welfare staff. We feel that this is one way in which we may be able to gain some ground on this problem and help to solve the problem on a temporary basis.

Perhaps while I'm on my feet I should comment on the larger criticism that was levied by the Member for Lakeside in which he indicated that -- I believe this is what he said -- that people with common sense and without training are better than people with training alone, and I suppose if that's what he said many of us might agree with his thinking -- (interjection) -- No that's true, it isn't quite what you said. I do think personally, and have thought so for a long time, and I think anyone in the welfare field would agree that there is a tremendously big area for the volunteer -- tremendously big. It's not being met today. I think there is substantial evidence that many agencies are under-staffed -- many voluntary agencies are under-staffed. Certainly we know our Community Chest is falling substantially short of their goals because the good people that the Member for Lakeside talked about are not coming forward in sufficient numbers. I have no criticism of those who are working in this field but there is a large area of unmet need in the voluntary field that isn't being met by people.

The strange thing about this whole problem is that the criticism seemed to arise as a result of experiences with various Children's Aid Societies, with welfare or social workers operating under Children's Aid Societies, and I would just like to ask who for Heaven's sakes are administering these Children's Aid Societies if it isn't the mature people, the fathers and mothers who have come through the experience of bringing up families and who are now free and able to offer themselves to service to their fellow man and who are coming forward and doing a wonderful job through the Children's Aid Society. Aren't these the people of maturity that are guiding the work of these welfare workers and aren't these the people who have accepted this kind of responsibility? And now we say that there are others who might do the job much better. Frankly, I must confess there may be. There may be some social workers who aren't doing a good job, the same way that there may be some doctors that aren't doing a good job and some lawyers that aren't doing a good job and maybe even some politicians that aren't doing a

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . good job.

Well I'd like to tell you that we have lots of evidence here of the fact that there have been many untrained social workers working in the Province of Manitoba for years and years because these are some of the problems we're dealing with today. I understand that the City of Winnipeg did not have a professionally trained social worker until about 1956 or 1957 -- in fairly recent times. And some of the problems that we are facing down there on Salter and Jarvis today are problems that have developed over the last 10, 15 and 20 years, and these people have been on the welfare lists for all of that time and they have not been rehabilitated. I'm not saying it's solely because they had untrained workers. I won't say that. I won't say that at all, but this is some of the evidence that was developed during a period of time in which we had largely untrained workers in that particular field.

The member for Lakeside said that we should have those people that had come through life's ordinary experiences of being a father or a mother and things like that. Well I'd just like to say this, that we aren't concerned with people who are coming through life's ordinary experiences. We're dealing with people who have suffered severe emotional and social dislocations, people who have real problems. I don't doubt that a mother with experience can look after a child who has the normal childhood diseases, but when a child is sick that mother -- really sick -- that mother takes him to someone who can give the kind of professional advice that she needs for her child, and I think that this is the kind of thing we are talking about. We are not talking about ordinary life situations; we are talking about special problems; and there aren't many people that have lived through the kind of social dislocation that is taking place in Manitoba and in Canada today because these experiences are just being built up and developed today as circumstances change.

I would like to say that I don't think that the Legislature and this committee is the proper place to bring up special questions of individual adoption cases. Possibly so if they try to illustrate the larger point, but the member for St. Boniface raised the question last year and I said to him at that time, you come to me and we'll discuss this matter privately because I'm sure there's information here that would help you to better understand the problem that we're facing and here 12 months later he still has not been to see me yet he chooses to raise this question on the floor of the House again.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . exactly the way it happened. I remember the offer the Honourable Minister made and I went to see him right in the House, sat in that House at that chair beside him, and I told him the case and he was supposed to get the information and I'm waiting -- I've been waiting for 12 months. There's a little difference here.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I invite the Honourable Member to come to my office next week. If he would give me the name of the case, I'll see that the file is there and I'll see that the properly qualified people are there to discuss this case with him. I don't recall that I had an obligation to bring him further particulars, but I apologize if there has been that misunderstanding.

But I would like to say that I would be very pleased to discuss his case or the case that was raised by the Member for La Verendrye because I think that he indicated that there may be two sides to this case and I venture to say that there are, that there is another side, and I think he could benefit from that kind of a discussion with us and, if he likes, we would be very happy to get the head of the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba to come in because I think this is the kind of thing that should be discussed so that we have a better understanding before we make these broad sweeping charges of immature people, people not properly qualified, young people just freshly out of high school or whatever it is.

We don't deny a doctor the right to practice when he graduates. We're wanting to get people who are better skilled, who better understand human problems in the kind of social dislocation that's taking place. How do we get them if we deny them the right to practice their profession? This is an area in which we need the best kind of people we can get and we'll not get them if we keep running down the profession of social work, because we're in very difficult times and we want the best kind of people we can get in this particular field.

I think that the member for Lakeside is probably way back in the days of the farm-dominated economy that we spoke about when we first opened the discussions on these estimates, because at that time probably there was more scope for the person with common sense

(Mr. Carroll, Cont'd.) . . . to deal with problems because we didn't have the severe social dislocations, the disruptions that we have today. And I venture to say that farmers being good practical people they knew how to build roads and do all sorts of things, but today we hire the best kind of engineers we can get to build our highways. We don't question the advisability of engineering competence when we're designing highways and building technical things. We want the best kind of people we can get and I propose to the House that this is what we want in trained social workers as well. We want people who can have the greatest knowledge that they can get to come and help us out with some of our very serious social problems.

We in the Department of Welfare have a great many non-professionally trained people and we select the best kind of people we can get -- the Civil Service Commission select the best people they can get and more than half of our staff of people who deal with the public are non-professionals. But we find this: we find that they're much less effective without training than those who have the professional training. We're doing the best we can and these people themselves recognize their limitations, because once they have been in the department for awhile they're coming to us and saying, if we want to do a more effective job in this department we need more training, and they're applying for bursaries and are going to university to get this kind of professional training because it enables them to do their job better. Frankly, we're embarking too on -- we've always had an in-service training -- but we're embarking on a beefed-up in-service training to try and help these people who are non-professionals do a better job within the department itself.

Now I have a report here by a gentleman by the name of Philip S. Fisher who is Chairman of the Board of the Southam Company Limited. He is one of these men who has lived through life's experiences and he has done a great deal of public service work in his life. He served on the Board of the Canadian Welfare Council and he has served as Chairman of the Commission on Education and Personnel for the Canadian Welfare Council. I'm just going to read two short paragraphs of a rather lengthy speech that he made just recently on January 30th on the subject of training for social work and he says this:

"We are pouring millions upon millions of taxpayers' money and millions in voluntary giving into the welfare field and we haven't the personnel to do the job properly. This means that overall we aren't getting the best value for our money and the individual isn't getting the best service. We must develop enough staff and appropriately trained staff." And this is the key -- "the trained staff must consist of professional social workers and also of workers with lesser qualifications for lesser jobs, but all of them must have training." This is the point that he makes in his statement in Toronto on January 30th.

I have in my hand here a document that was prepared by volunteers in the Province of Manitoba. These are the kind of people that the member for Lakeside was talking about today, people with experience in life; people who have been around a great deal; experienced business people, people with distinguished careers in various fields of endeavour. I'd like to ask if Mr. D. A. Thompson, Q.C. represents the kind of volunteer that the member for Lakeside is talking about, or N. Elliott Rogers or the Most Reverend Howard Clark. These are the kind of people who are volunteers who have lived through a great deal of life and have a great deal of experience behind them -- and the Reverend Gratton . . . and Sam Goodman and Dr. Leslie Hancock, representing the Winnipeg Council of Women; and Dr. Abram Kravetz and Rabbi Philip . . . ; and W. Scott Neal, a businessman representing the Chamber of Commerce; J. A. Scollin, a member of the Law Society -- they let everybody on -- Mrs. O. W. Struthers, here's one of these ladies who has lived through life, probably a mother I don't know; Alderman Edith Tennant.

These are people who have the kind of service that we were thinking about. And what did they recommend in their report? What did they recommend? They recommended right through more professionally trained staff, people who know what they are doing in the welfare field, and I'd like to read the recommendation. "The newly established and valuable bursary program of the Attorney-General's Department should be further developed and advanced courses for graduate and undergraduate probation officers should be provided in co-operation with the University of Manitoba." They want professionally trained probation people. Surely these people of good judgment should know what they are talking about, because they investigated these problems. Recommendation No. 36, "provision should be made for special courses

(Mr. Carroll, Cont'd.) . . . in correctional work through the school of social work at the University of Manitoba to encourage the recruitment of personnel as well as to provide necessary training. A professional social worker should be provided in each adult correctional institution to counsel prisoners," etc. This is some of the advise that we are getting from the kind of people of good judgment that I think the member for Lakeside was talking about today.

Now if you don't mind, I'll reply to the question about amateur sports.

MR. CAMPBELL: Maybe the honourable Minister wouldn't mind if I would answer his question at this time, because he was asking me if these were the people I was talking about. Well inasmuch as I spoke entirely about women, I think his question would be answered that I wasn't talking about Don Thompson or Elliot Rogers or the Rev. H. H. Clark.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I would like to say a few words. I have been quiet listening and trying to absorb what other members had to say, and I notice that quite a few members have expressed their opinion and they seem to be very proud of the fact that such a huge amount is being spent on welfare. Maybe it is necessary. I'm not going to argue that point, but I would say that just the fact that a huge amount of money is spent on welfare does not necessarily mean that this money was spent desirably, as it should have been. It seems to me that I would be much happier if next year the Department of Welfare was to report that the conditions have so greatly, have so vastly improved that our estimates in welfare have decreased by a few million. Probably it's impossible, I don't know. I know that welfare spending is absolutely necessary in our sad society at the present time.

I mentioned before that I think every year that we should be very careful that we help the needy, the really needy people and not the greedy -- that has been mentioned before -- because I feel that if money is spent on the greedy people, undeserving people, that money is certainly not spent properly. It's money that is wasted and it seems to me that the present government has created a kind of image of easy-going with the money. I hear that. It's not my own thinking. Easy-going with the money and if the people get that impression that it is very easy to get the money from the government, they will go after that because they feel -- oh my neighbor is getting some kind of an allowance, a social allowance, so why shouldn't I? The government is paying and I pay towards the government in one form or another, so why shouldn't I get some of it back? And they will plan -- not all of them, but I mean the greedy ones -- will plan and scheme and probably conceal their need and try to cajole the workers -- and I'm not attacking the workers -- to go ahead and recommend them for social allowances.

MR. CARROLL: Who gives us the money if it isn't the workers?

MR. TANCHAK: No, it's not the workers. Even some people like to boast about it. They seem to think that it is in fashion, it is in style to be getting some kind of relief. Years ago it was truly only those people who needed help. They went to the municipality, to the municipal men, those men knew everybody in the district and they knew whether they were deserving or not and they did not apply unless they actually needed such help.

Now I am not saying that the welfare workers are not capable. I believe that they are capable but I agree with the Honourable Minister when he did say that in order to eliminate this abuse we probably need more social workers so that they would be able to spend more time and sift these people through, and he bemoaned the fact that there are not enough social workers in the field. And what does he say? And that's where I disagree with the Honourable Minister. I don't think that he gave a true report to this House when he made this statement, and I'll read it from Hansard. He says: "We sincerely wish we could attract more young people who are wanting to work with people to help improve the lives of others, because this is really one of the weaknesses of the Department of Welfare."

Well, he gave us the impression that he was so good and he'd give everything possible, he'd like to help these people but the thing is that he is short of the social workers and they do not want -- our young people do not desire to go into this profession because somewhere farther in here he says there's a stigma attached to it. I disagree with the Minister, and I would go as far as to say that that statement was not correct. I would like the Minister, when he makes a statement, to give us really the true facts and I know what I am saying. At the time I was going to get up but others were a little quicker on their feet and did get up and they had something else to say, so I have been waiting today.

And I would say this to the Honourable Minister, that among our young people there is a

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)...great deal more enthusiasm for social work education than the Minister stated. I know for a fact that last year the school of social work was unable to accept very many applicants — sure, some of them probably because of insufficient qualifications, but many others were turned down due to inadequacy of present facilities in the school of social work, and I have checked that. At present, the fourth floor of the Arts Building houses the facilities and there is very limited space there.

We know in the past when similar problems arose in other departments, the government was just too willing to build new buildings and increase the staff and so on. Why is this not done with the School of Social Work? If we are so short of social workers, why isn't this done? I think the Minister is to blame. I think the Minister could push this a little bit or at least, if he hasn't got the money, he can come right out and say give us the money, but don't blame it on the young people that they are not eager to help their own fellow man.

I disagree with that because I know many, many who are willing to go out and take this social study to be able to help their fellow men. There are more applications for the school than the school can presently handle. There is your own admission, acknowledgment that we need more social workers. There is desire on the part of the school of social work to educate more people, and contrary to what the Minister has just said yesterday, there is a desire on the part of our young people to enter the school of social work but the main difficulty appears to be lack of funds for increasing the facilities and the lack of staff at the social work.

This situation could be corrected by the government if the Minister instead of standing before us here and trying to tell us what a good fellow he is and how helpless he is, because due to circumstances beyond his own control -- if he would act instead of making such weak excuses, I think we would get further on than that, and then he would be able to say I have tried to get more trained social workers, which we need, but I am sorry we haven't got the money. But just to give this weak excuse that the people are not anxious to enter this, I disagree with the Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think you should blame us if we take a little too long on this subject because the Minister brought in the same thing for the third time after last night. I don't know what happened, but apparently he's not satisfied. It seems that whenever this Minister is weak, and he is always weak, he starts by talking about five years ago, what happened five or six years ago. Well I personally don't care what happened five years ago. I'm talking about now -- that's what we are here for now -- this year. .... (Recording failure three to four minutes) .....this is all right, but some people resent it -- young girls, not that they weren't qualified. I said that and nobody mentioned anything about high school kids. I just mentioned that -- he suggests that this year he would have a lot of first year students, and I said I hope you don't have them starting to ask these kind of questions. This is the only thing I said. I only felt that the people should go through with the explanation, the education of the people that I suggest. Probably the majority of the people would go along. They will understand. They'd co-operate with you. The people of Manitoba are understandable. And there are some people who would be good parents but they just couldn't make themselves answer these questions, and I suggested then that maybe they should have a doctor in the department or maybe an older social worker, an older person who would inspire -- not that they would be more qualified but maybe people with a little more experience, and people that would inspire more confidence. I don't think that he can deny that. We all have to learn. We all have to age a bit. I don't think that he'll deny that, that some people will think this doctor is very good. They'll give him a chance and fill him in on certain things. They feel -- they might be wrong, but they feel they want somebody a little more mature, that looks a little more mature. This is human nature. And this is all I asked, that certain people, that they have a chance; not that this social worker asking certain questions, if they don't want to answer that this is finished, the door is closed. In my dumb way I guess I thought those were constructive criticisms, and this is what I thought we were supposed to do here tonight. So if he wants to start re-acting that, I'm ready. But I don't think that he has to make any accusation and pretend that he's the saviour of the social workers like he did here this evening. He talked a lot and he didn't say a thing, didn't say a thing about the questions that we asked. Is there a new policy in this? We haven't heard anything about that. We heard how terrific those people were -- and we know that. We know that these people are dedicated; and we know

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...that there's a lot of volunteers. We know that there are volunteers on the Board of the Children's Aid Society -- nobody has suggested otherwise. And what my honourable friend suggests this afternoon is that we take more of those people to do the actual work, the field work, not raise money for the Community Chest. This is not what he was suggesting. We know that this is .....This is not the point at all. So I would suggest that he try to take this criticism, or suggestion, or constructive criticism the way it is meant to be, and if it is wrong all right. But not turn things around and try to embarrass people and try and put them on the defensive, which is a favourite trick of his and I don't like that at all. If he wants to keep it up I can stay all night and .....on this department all night.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman .....have a word with my honourable friend because I'm simply amazed that he took my constructive suggestions that had no criticism in them but an effort to help him out so much to heart, and then treated me to a tirade and a lecture about what a wonderful job he's doing and all that he knows about what are necessary for these people.

Like my honourable friend from St. Boniface I hate to have to go over this suggestion of mine a second and third time but evidently my honourable friend didn't understand it. Does he know what I was trying to tell him? I was trying to tell him that if they're really short of social workers, trained social workers, then I wasn't meaning just volunteer workers of the kind that are on Don Thompson's committee. I was meaning people who would volunteer to work for remuneration. Did I not mention that? Did my honourable friend not understand that? I was meaning people that they could use, and I mentioned particularly in the field of adoption, and that's where I talked about people, mature people, meaning ones not distinctly young, not distinctly old, not in the lower income group, not in the higher income group; people that had been through the experiences of life as people who would be useful in that field, and that he could get them and pay them something. Now my honourable friend comes back with this tirade and lecture and says that this is ridiculous because they're working with emotionally disturbed people. Are these people that are asking to adopt children emotionally disturbed people? No. Well then, why if my honourable friend shakes his head now, what was he talking about? This is nonsense to reply to a suggestion of that kind in these terms. If my honourable friend wants to get any suggestions from this side of the House, then let him treat them as though they're given in a constructive frame of mind.

And then when you move into another field, I say to my honourable friend. I'm perfectly serious in this. He could get help in this area, and these people would be good, and in my opinion I would like to see them tried out in competition with these trained social service workers, not that I said there was anything wrong with having trained social service workers. I'd like to see these people tried out in competition and judged, not by the social workers, but by somebody who combines practical experience along with training in that field of work, and see how they got along in adoption, and with the people that are on social assistance too, because these folks aren't emotionally disturbed people. Some of them may be, of course. They're economically disturbed people mainly. This is the trouble with them, and some practical people coming along could be of help to them. My honourable friend doesn't need to become so vehement about the fact that he thinks that this was a criticism of his staff. This was because he's been telling us all last evening that he's short of staff and he can't get them. Now what's the matter with that? And why should we be treated to a lecture of this kind?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, .....my honourable friend that if this is such a good idea, why don't the common sense people who are running the Children's Aid Societies in Manitoba hire more of this kind of person? Because after all you probably know the people that are on the Board of the Society operating at Portage la Prairie. I think that you would agree that they're common sense adults, mature people, and these are the kind of people that are hiring social workers. Why aren't they hiring the kind of people you're talking about? Because I venture to say in their judgment they feel that there is more sense in hiring a person specially trained in this particular area of responsibility than hiring people who do not have training in this field. And I went on -- and I may be wrong -- I took your criticisms this afternoon, while it did originate with the Children's Aid Societies and that kind of criticism, to be more of a criticism of social workers in general, and I wanted to say that one of the problems we face today is the problem of getting trained people to work with the kinds of social

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . problems and the kinds of social dislocation that we're faced with today, that require people who have more knowledge and skill and understanding of unordinary situations than those people who have just come through a normal adult life and have ordinary experiences in life, because these aren't ordinary situations--(interjection) -- I quite agree.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations and pass on a few criticisms in reference to the Community Development Program which we have been discussing under No. 1. -- (Interjection) -- Well I have this, Mr. Chairman, tied in with the No. 1.

MR. ROBLIN: Should we not deal with Item No. 1 and get on with it and get the thing rolling a little bit? -- (Interjection) -- Well, let's have another try.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 passed, Item 3 passed -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? We we just passed 3, we're on No. 3.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: . . . . . on 1 (b) sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: . . . . .Community Development Program and that's the item under 1(b) is it not?

MR. ROBLIN: Right. And I think we should hear it.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Was that 1 (b) now, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. -- go ahead.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am rather pleased that the government are doing such an excellent job in this field. However, I must apologize for not knowing my north country the way the Honourable Minister of Welfare knows it. He speaks with a great deal of knowledge of the north, and has reminded me quite strongly the other evening that with his qualifications I think we rightfully could call him the Big White Indian Chief, and I think that would be quite an appropriate definition. I also would like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Minister that if he doesn't know where Kanuchuan Falls are, which he should, just in case he doesn't know the distance from Kanuchuan Falls to Norway House, it's 128 snowshoe miles, it's 110 air miles, it's 138 canoe miles by paddle, and it's 180 walking miles, and although the Honourable Minister's possibly younger than I am, I would venture to say that if we both started out of Island Lake on snowshoes, I'd be in Norway House just a little bit ahead of him. And I think that he has gone very much afield, and he has been talking around in circles about the pulpwood co-operative, the co-operative fishing operations. This is nothing new. This is something that is good for the Indians in the north. Excellent! This is what they should be given. I can also tell the Minister that 20 or 30 miles from the mouth of the Berens River you have a stretch of land that would make excellent grazing land for the cattle and raising of sheep; and I happen to have covered that area personally on two or three occasions. I can also tell my friend that there is 2,200 horsepower at Kanuchuan Rapids, or Falls, which is available for the development of any industry that the Indians may care to undertake, and not at four or five mills per kilowatt -- I'd be glad to give it to them for one cent per kilowatt hour.

There was mention made of the tremendous success story -- that was used in the plural sense, stories. I'd like to see where these huge Indian developments in terms of industry and these tremendous success stories are. Let's have some examples. Where are you establishing industries among the Indians? What is it that you are able to do that the Department of Industry and Commerce is not able to do? It seems to me that the Honourable Minister is in the attitude that, "you name it, we've got it," the same way as he mentioned about the job training earlier in the sitting of this House, and if he wants more proof on that job training, I hesitate to read a very embarrassing letter to the other side of the House in reference to that specific job training proposition, and it's certainly anything but complimentary. I think that in his befuddled way of presenting his estimates and making his overall approach -- I don't think there's any overall policy, because I might ask you, what is it that the Indian in the north wants? He wants house and he wants food. You come from a constituency that you should know better than say that certain living conditions are not so. Do you realize that the average Indian is happy and can build a cabin for himself in the north for under \$400 a cabin? I know what I'm talking about, because this is what we did with them. I might ask the honourable member how many sawmill units have you got in the north? Do you undertake to make sure the

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)...Indian will cut his own logs, get them out and create his own lumber? Has he got a planer so he can produce his own shiplap and his own two by fours, his own sills for the windows? I don't think you have a single sawmill as developed by your community program. Under the federal Department of Indian Affairs, yes. Instead, we buy lumber and pay \$125.00 a thousand and then pay another \$100.00 a thousand to get it into the territory of the Indian. Can't the Indian produce his lumber himself?

You know, it's all very well, all very nice, to speak about the great work that is being done in the Community Development, but if you ask any truly businessmen associated with the Department of Industry and Commerce, who are working with business and are capable to develop these businesses, have you asked any of them to go up and establish industries among the Indians? What's wrong with raising bees up at Island Lake? What's wrong with raising potatoes and growing carrots up in the Island Lake area? Have you encouraged the Indians in that direction? I don't even want to ask you how many cultivated acres you have developed in the last two or three summers. I know who developed them. I know who helped them. Mr. Chairman, I last year got up and defended the Indian and Metis population in this province. I want to tell you that there is no finer individual if properly handled, but the white man when he abuses the Indian and Metis cannot expect that same respect from the Indian and Metis when you haven't treated him right; but give him his due credit and treat him properly, and he will take care of himself. He, like anybody else, wants a little assistance, a little guidance, and he doesn't want to be looked upon as being a charity or a parasite on anybody's doling out, on anybody's welfare. He's just as honourable and proud as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has mentioned here. If you go along Lake Winnipeg, whether it's the Bloodvein or the Berens River, or Poplar River or Rabbit Point or at the Narrows, there are Indian communities in all of these places, and with the transportation coming down Lake Winnipeg, you can, and it is no problem to set up small little industries in these points. The cost of freight in and out is very reasonable. There is aircraft transportation coming in and out of these areas, and this is the kind of thing we should be talking about. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we would do well to possibly look upon the Community Development Program among the Indians and Metis of this province in the form of encouraging them to realize how valuable the cultivation of vegetables and a garden is to them during the summer and as a source of vegetables in the wintertime, so that we don't have to fly in potatoes, for instance, into the remote areas at \$8.00 and \$10.00 a bag for air freight, which is done and which is carried out. Instead, that \$8.00 could be well spent into a pair of overshoes or something of that nature. Has it ever occurred to us that we should possibly be taking some of the tanned cowhide from the south and taking it into the north so that the Indian women could sew them into some excellent Indian moccasins? And Indian gloves. And mitts -- which you could sell at the premium price. This is the kind of assistance they want. This is the kind of help they want. And I tell you that if you set up the proper approach on sawmills so the Indian can go and cut his own logs, have his own saw and timber and have his own planer so he can finish his lumber, now this is the kind of help that the Indian understands.

You look back over all the communities in northern Manitoba, and the ones that have done best are usually the ones that have been encouraged along these lines, whether it's been the federal Department of Indian Affairs or whether it's been the individual missionaries whether they be the United Church or the Roman Catholic Church; and it is in these areas that the people have done best, and you will find at Garden Hill and at Island Lake and at Red Sucker Lake and at Sandy Lake, which is Ontario, these are the outstanding, most independent and the best type of Indians that come off these reservations, because they have been encouraged by the white man. The white man has brought them into his own house and has treated them like human beings and has shown them the way of life. If you go into any tent, and I defy anybody in this House to go into their tent, and it's as clean as you can ever expect a tent any other place. They'll invite you -- you may sit on a floor of spruce boughs, but it's clean, and you can have a cup of coffee or a cup of tea with him and it comes and it's prepared for you and given to you in a very clean cup. True enough, COMEF says maybe 3,500 fishermen are going to lose their jobs on Lake Winnipeg, but I might ask the Honourable Minister what have you done, what has your department done to provide work for those 3,500 people? Have you appealed to the Department of Industry and Commerce to help out? There are many interested

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)...businessmen in this province who would be glad to establish industries among the Indians.

Mr. Chairman, there's one other thing I would like to bring to the attention of this House. I would very much like to know how many years the Honourable Minister has served on a board of an Old Folks Home or on a board of a hospital board, and I take exception to his remarks, because I have served on an Old Folks Home for over 13 years and have taken a very active part, given many, many hours and many, many days of my work and effort and contributed heavily. I have also given many, many hours of my time to the hospital boards in this city and to the Red Feather agency, and I do not think that all of us here should be covered under a blanket policy that for all of a sudden somebody has discovered that there are such agencies, that there are good-hearted people who donate and give of their time on these boards to further this type of work in our province, and all of a sudden somebody finds that this is in existence and then he challenges everybody around him. Mr. Chairman, there are many, many, many people in this City of Winnipeg that devote many, many hours to charity, whether they serve on a hospital board, or Old Folks Home, or on the Red Cross, or on the Children's Hospital, and I think that these people deserve at all times nothing more than the highest of praise, and I don't think that there should be any question about their intention or anything of that nature whatsoever.

Our honourable friend speaks very much of things being in equilibrium. To me if you have false equilibrium you have no equilibrium at all, because there is the other equilibrium such as you have chemical equilibrium, you have physical equilibrium; you have nuclear equilibrium, and I wonder what equilibrium he is talking about at times. Thank you Mr. Chairman. The thing is, what I am bringing out, Mr. Chairman, is that it appears there is no difference between black and white as described by my honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend the Member for Burrows for his work on hospital boards and on boards of Elderly Persons' Housing projects. I think this is a very commendable thing and a very wonderful thing for any member of the House or any member who is interested in people. I also commend him for his respect for the Indian people of Manitoba, because I believe that he sincerely has respect for those people.

I do say, though, that he appears to have the same appalling lack of understanding of community development as was demonstrated by the member for St. Boniface last night. He doesn't understand what we are trying to do. He hasn't been listening to what we've been saying. Community development is not equated with economic development although economic development may be part of community development. Certainly economic development is important to the Indian people of this province, because there is no more unemployment or more under-employed people in this province than our Indians, but I think you can have achievement in other areas besides economic development. You can have achievement in social development. You can help them in better understanding the problems that they face. You can help to develop their skills and their education, their ability to cope with problems that they're facing, and this is the area in which we work as well as in the economic sphere with Indians and Metis in Manitoba. We certainly have involved the business community. Certainly we know about the efforts of the Department of Industry and Commerce, but the Member for Burrows isn't even interested in listening to what I have to say. This is what bothers me terribly. No wonder he has such an appalling lack of understanding. He doesn't want to hear. I ask, did you know that we have an Advisory Committee on Employment, on which we have a great many highly respected employers interested in providing employment, in getting employment for Indian people? Did you know that? . . . . . listen to the Member for St. Boniface, he's getting the idea. He's starting to listen now. There's hope for you too, if we've got the Member for St. Boniface listening. And I do agree, I do agree that the Indian does not want to be a parasite. He wants to be proud to stand on his own feet, and this is the aim of Community Development to help him in succeeding in the goals that he sets for himself. We try to recognize the cultural differences, the social differences, between the Indian and the white man. We have to work with him at his level, to lend the kind of assistance that he asks for, to help them in discussing their problems and understanding their problems and in setting goals for themselves, whether they be in the economic sphere or in the social sphere or whatever, and we have many examples of accomplishment apart from the economic development among these people.

Certainly we are trying to do something about the development of handicrafts and getting more hides for these people work on. Our program was just established last year and we've had the first Manitoba handicraft display and we are encouraging these people more and more to work in this particular field of endeavour. And he did mention something interesting. He mentioned his experiences in northern Ontario and I regret that I haven't had experience myself in that province, but I do know that those members from the National Indian Council who came from Ontario, and northern Ontario too, they looked at what we were doing in Manitoba and said "we believe in community development. We believe you people in Manitoba have the right idea." And even the Government of Ontario looked, in touring through the northern part of the province, "we say we think you are on the right track here in Manitoba," and certainly we haven't accomplished very much so far but we have made a beginning and we've got a lot of catching up to do and we hope to continue catching up and we hope to resolve this problem at some time in the future.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . .catching up to do too. I've just come back in time to get the tail end of his second speech and start over from last night again on point No. 2. Now I don't know what time -- it was while he was talking about the Honourable Member from Burrows, and then the Member from St. Boniface, and maybe -- Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would ask him to listen, because I wish he'd listen also, so we don't start a fourth time. What I asked him, what I suggested yesterday, was to try to understand the Indian by looking at things through his eyes, not trying to force the Indian to do something imitative, but to do something that we wanted him to do. I stated that I felt that the Indian was not understood here and was accused of many things because we felt that he should come to our civilization, and I wasn't talking about economics. I was just talking about helping the Indian, and I suggest that we should bring industry closer to his home. I felt that like every other human being the Indian and the Metis felt a little more secure when they were closer to home, and I thought that this was very important and I felt that it was unjust to bring him in this jungle that the city is, just because we can't give him work anywhere else. The Honourable Minister said, well they want to go -- sure, they don't want to starve. They have to come to the city and we're trying to rush things. This is what I was trying to say again. I was trying to be constructive, believe it or not, and I was suggesting that it would be an awful lot to try to understand these people, that I felt we were going a little too far a little too fast. I felt that if they were closer to home, to their families, to their security, and the type of work. I said that they used to be fishermen and he did say himself too, that the report that we had too many fishermen, so the poor Indian had to go, because he can't afford fishing like these other richer white brothers here in Manitoba, so he had to lose the fishing, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Rupertsland could tell us a little bit about that. I'm sure that he could. And I suggested that there's an awful lot of things that these people could do, because they were very capable with their hands, and they were active people and they were proud. They wanted not charity, they wanted their self respect. I mentioned this the same as he did. In fact, last night the Honourable Minister got up and he said, "well on this I agree with him," but I guess he read his speech again and now he doesn't agree. I don't know what he's doing but this is what I suggested, and I'm certainly not ashamed. I'll repeat it again -- that I think that we should try to bring industry.

My leader read and gave suggestions of what was being done in the States. I think they had a watch factory close to a reservé where the people worked. From what I understand, the Indian that we accuse of stealing here can give everything, can give his shirt, because this is the way he feels. If somebody wants something they are welcome in his home. They are welcome to the last piece of bread. They'll split it, and then he feels when he needs it well he'll do the same. It is not our standard of living -- we're supposed to be really modern. We live in a world that we judge people by how much money they have too often, and they are not like that. They're not too worried about these things and therefore we think they're not modern. We think that they are not civilized and we accuse them of stealing. It's true that these people want to work. They work enough to live, that's all, so this is not right, because here the millionaire wants more and we are working 24 hours a day trying to get more. We are never satisfied. Well they are not interested in this kind of civilization. They want to work enough to earn a living. They can work a full day and they might take off for a couple of hours, and we can't

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...change them from one day to the other. This is what I was trying to say. Maybe I'm wrong but I think it's worth trying. I know that some of them will come to the city. I hope that they will, because we will have integration to a point, but those that would sooner stay on their reserve a little longer; they feel they are not quite ready; they want to be -- we say we have no prejudice because we tolerate them. Well we have to do more than tolerate, we have to accept them; we have to look at their problems through their eyes. I think that this is the way and I think that's it a good idea to bring, maybe trying to talk somebody here -- this is what we were suggesting, my Leader and I yesterday, that we talk these people into maybe bringing a watch factory or something out because these people are good workers and we can pay them. Maybe they would miss the odd day of work. They won't change from one day to the other. They don't like to be conformists just for the sake of being conformists, and to them they're doing the right thing. Who are we to say well, you have to live the way we do. That will take awhile, but if we bring something, we could do a lot of work and give them piece work, pay them by the hour, or pay them by the work that they put out. I think that this has been tried out other places and it has worked.

You see, the only thing here, Mr. Chairman, every time somebody says something in the estimates with a few of the Ministers, right away they are little tin gods and we're trying to knock them down their perch, from their ivory tower. We can't suggest anything, and I'm gullible enough to think that this is what we were elected for and this is the duty of the Opposition, and I thought this was what we were here for, to try and give ideas. Definitely, the government and the members of the Cabinet and the Cabinet Ministers are free to do what they want with this, but I don't think that everything should be turned around. Because I say there's some improvement in the adoption, then I'm against social workers. Because I think that some of these questions should be asked in a more discreet way, then I think that it's not important to find out about the home. That if I think we should try maybe a new approach or another approach, try to give a little more credit to the Indian, that I don't understand the Indians or that I don't know what the government is trying to do. I'm not suggesting that the Minister has to accept everything I say, that he has to rush tomorrow and start a new program. I'm suggesting that I'm trying my best the same as he is, and that I think that I'm just as sincere, not only I am, as any member in this House, and I think that we have been invited by the members on the other side, the members opposite us, to offer constructive criticism and this is what we are trying to do, and there is something wrong in Manitoba with the adoption. The people are waiting too long -- and I'm not going to start again. I think there's something wrong. I think we can improve, we can always improve, and I think we can improve in our relationship with the Indians and the Metis. I think we could render them a better service than bringing them in this jungle here and crowding them in a slum area where they are lost -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm safe tonight because my friend is not here. I don't care where they go. I think that these people will come in when they're ready, some of them will come in but I think we should try to give them a little more confidence, and this is all that I suggest.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the other evening I asked two or three questions and I apparently either missed the answers or they were not given to us. I ask my honourable friend if Bill No. 49 and Bill No. 6 as passed at the 1959 session, if there had been any extensions made. They are the acts respecting social security for residents of Manitoba. Now my honourable friend has said that he has got the train on the track now and all that needs to do is get the thing rolling. Well according to the program -- I think that's the right word to use -- that my honourable friends put out back about three elections ago, you'll recall this one surely because you and I....

MR. CARROLL: I wonder if the member would like to raise this on the item in the estimates rather than on community development.

MR. SHOEMAKER: On the what?

MR. CARROLL: Would you like to raise this on the Item -- and I believe you're talking about social allowances.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, where are we at?

MR. CARROLL: We are at community development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on (b) under Item 1.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now can I have your assurance, Mr. Chairman, that you are going

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...to call them, (a), (b), (c), (d)? You haven't been doing that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on (b) Community Development. We've passed (a), we're on (b) and we're just passing (b), and then we'll come down to Welfare Services.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well 2 (c) is Social Allowances.

MR. CARROLL: We haven't reached that yet.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Fine. -- (Interjections) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. WRIGHT: Would you kindly tell me what Item you are on? Is there anything wrong with you calling the sub-headings when you get to Elderly Persons' Housing, or why the sudden rush? Mr. Chairman, I have sat here since last evening waiting patiently for the Item. I'm one of these that co-operate here and I don't want you to railroad the item through when it comes -- there is nothing wrong with you saying Item 1 (c) Elderly Persons' Housing, and I respectfully ask that you do that.

MR. ROBLIN: .....after the discussions we've had here for the past two or three days. I understand, however, my honourable friend's point. He is very patient and obeys the rules and I'm sure we'd like to hear him on Elderly Persons' Housing right now if he'd like to speak.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the First Minister that we can't blame you for railroading but we can blame you for trying to.

MR. ROBLIN: No, that's really not a fair charge. The Committee has been dealing with these matters very patiently. We've been all over the lot and it would be -- (Interjection) -- All right, I'm not casting any reflections on anybody. I'm simply stating the facts. We've been all over the lot and it would be very helpful if members would stick to the Item under discussion. We now want to hear about Elderly Persons' Housing.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the First Minister should have the last word on this. The estimates were opened with a general statement by the Minister and everybody has been called under that cue. Now we've come to take the items one by one, and the Members of the Opposition are asking that we take them slowly so that if any member has anything to say on any Item he will have an opportunity to do so. That's all we're asking for.

MR. ROBLIN: I know that I'm never going to have the last word with my honourable friend, and I agree with him. We want to take them one by one. That's exactly what I hope we are doing.

MR. WRIGHT: The other evening I mentioned the federal buildings that have been vacated at Cranberry Portage and the First Minister was good enough to tell me that negotiations are going on in regard to these buildings. I would just like to point out that at Cranberry Portage is a Senior Citizens development in the form of the staff buildings there, and already built and I hope the government will not overlook that fact when they come to finalize the negotiations for taking over the radar plant at Cranberry Portage.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, would you please tell us where we are at now. What item are we on right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: .....calling (c) of Item 1, Elderly Persons' Housing. That's on Item 1. If you'll watch carefully, we'll then come to number 2, and I'm going to call them (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) so -- you're ready -- (c) passed. Item 2, (a) passed.

MR. TANCHAK: I believe that I can bring this up here again. I raise the point here and submit the Minister misinformed the members here when he did say that young people -- he didn't use the same words but he indicated they were kind of thick-skinned maybe, because they don't feel that they should -- they have the desire to help their fellowmen. I did not get an answer and I still wonder what the Minister thinks. Does he think that he made a true statement then? I'd like an answer to that.

MR. CARROLL: I think, Mr. Chairman -- we are attempting in every way we can to get more good young people into the profession of social work. We're doing this by way of bursaries and by trying to attract them in any way that we can. We've doubled the bursaries within the last five years. We've encouraged the Children's Aid Societies to do the same thing, and we support that society financially to a very substantial extent. I think it is true that we lack good young men in the profession. We have an awful lot of good young men in it but I think we would

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)...like to see a whole lot more, because of the very real problem that we face when we get young ladies in the profession who are here with us for one or two or three years and sometimes a few more, and they leave to get married. It's quite a disrupting influence in the profession and I think that we would all agree that we would like to have more people in it. And if you care to look at our Annual Report you'll find that we have a substantially larger establishment for professional workers than is presently filled. Now it isn't a problem unique in Manitoba; it is a problem faced by welfare agencies throughout the Dominion of Canada. In fact the lecture that I read from a few minutes ago was one of the efforts that was being made to try to encourage more young people in this particular profession. There have been a great many conferences sponsored on how to attract more people in to staff the social service.

MR. TANCHAK: The Minister missed the point. What I objected to is the fact that the Minister said that there is no desire on the part of the young people, and I tried to prove to him that there is a desire on the part of the young people. I cannot see -- I still disagree with the Minister -- I cannot see why the Minister at this time does not want to admit that he did make a mistake and that wasn't a true statement that he made yesterday. I don't see why anybody should be so stubborn as not to say, "well I erred in that and maybe that wasn't exactly what I meant" or something, but to insist that it wasn't exactly what I said, I just disagree; and I never did say that this department hasn't done anything that's worthwhile, neither has the government. I've never accused the government of not doing anything and I agree with quite a lot of the legislation that the present government legislates, but to try to make us believe that this government never makes a mistake is just ridiculous. I listen to some of the Ministers who try to give us their impressions that the former people -- and they always keep throwing that back at us -- always made the mistakes and the present government doesn't make any mistakes. I would like to remind the Minister that we are all human and we are all subject to error, but to try and place yourselves in a position, try to make the people believe that you are thirteen little gods, I just don't agree with that, because we're all human and subject to error. And after hearing the Minister yesterday I took the trouble to inquire, and I phoned the School of Social Work today to find out who was right, and I did find out, and I'm sure now that a lot of these young people express a tremendous desire to go out and serve their fellowmen, and even though they feel that financially they may be at a disadvantage they still like to get into that and help, because they feel it in themselves, they feel they would like to improve our society. And that's what I am driving at. I don't like that impression left, the inference that our young people do not wish to enter into these services. That's only the point I was trying to make, and for the Minister to stand here and pretend that he's a martyr of some circumstances, he'd like to do his best, I simply don't agree with that. And if it's desirable to have more social workers let us get them. Expand the facilities and even give them more money if necessary but don't tell us that they are not willing to help society, because our young people are willing to help each other.

MR. CARROLL: .....leave the impression in the House that I was a god. I do confess to making mistakes. I do confess sometimes to being a little stubborn, but I do say there are a lot of young people coming into the profession, good young people. We still don't have enough. I think that's the impression I tried to convey.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the answer to some of the questions that I put yesterday and I will ask them again now. As regards social allowances, has the benefit been extended at all? Are there new regulations? I understand that since the legislation was put on the books five years ago, certainly the regulations must have changed on two or three different occasions. What's the last day on which they were changed? I have an old one before me here. Now I asked the question, too, whether the social allowances applied to the Indian population. According to the program of the Roblin Government as enunciated in the election campaign of 1958 and '59 they said that this is what they were all ready to do when the Opposition kicked them out of office, and it says the legislation was already in bill form and all ready to present to the people. Here's what they said on social allowance. I'm quoting from their own authorized propaganda. "Social Allowance -- an Act to ensure that no resident of Manitoba lacks essential food, clothing and shelter, or medical, dental or optical care" -- no resident. "These additional cash allowances are available for old age pensioners, to those

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...who are sick, the mentally ill, to widows with children, deserted mothers, neglected children. The legislation applies as well to Manitoba's Indian population. The progressive legislation is the first in Canada. The cost is shared by the Federal Government and represents appreciable savings to municipal taxpayers." Now is it a fact that there are no exceptions? That the Act now applies to everybody in the Province of Manitoba without any exception whatever, according to this? These are the things we want to know.

I think that I am right in my assumption. I note that under 2 (c) there is an additional two million roughly, two million odd in the estimates this year.

MR. CARROLL: .....question. The Social Allowances Act has been extended -- last year I believe it was announced in the House. We have changed the regulations very recently. I believe they were gazetted while this House was sitting and proved some embarrassment to us when someone felt that we were somehow or other usurping the privileges of the House. The Act does apply to Indians off reserve. When they move to the big city, then the Act applies to them as to any other Manitoba citizen. There are still some categories not covered, namely, the unemployed; the desertion cases less than four years; a woman whose husband is in jail for less than four years; to the unmarried mother with two or more children. These have not been .....

MR. SHOEMAKER: .....it is no longer necessary for you to be in receipt of a pension to qualify, that there is no age limit on the Social Allowance now. So long as they are unemployable, then they qualify regardless of age.

MR. CARROLL: We took over the unemployable. We started taking them over last year, about a year ago, and this has been a gradual take-over. It's on a needs basis; it's a personal thing. We are still short some social workers, so it's been a gradual process of assimilating quite a large caseload in the province. The estimates that are before the House now we believe are sufficient to include all of the caseload of unemployables during this particular fiscal year.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So that all of those persons who annually make application for total disability pension -- and there are quite a number, and there are a great number of them that are turned down by the Old Age Assistance -- then does the province under the Social Allowances Act automatically consider those an application for Social Allowance? I think they should. If a person has made application for total disability pension, blind persons or -- there is one other one I think in there -- then I suggest that the government should have a look at all those that have been rejected by the Old Age Assistance automatically.

MR. CARROLL: I must confess we don't do it automatically but most of them, I would venture to say, are picked up by us. I think they do have to make an application and they have to qualify on a needs basis.

.....continued on next page.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the Social Allowances Act and I should say at the beginning that I'm convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the Act is being administered by some pretty dedicated people. I believe that, like I said last year, that for people who are totally indigent it is a fine thing, but there are always those on the borderline who I think suffer sometimes as a result of the regulations. I heard the Minister say a short time ago that our economy was changing, that we were no longer a farm-dominated economy. That made an impression on me because I think it gives emphasis to what I have to say.

I want to talk, Mr. Chairman, about people, elderly people who are residing with their children. Because we are no longer a farm-dominated economy this can impose hardships in many cases on the younger folks. It isn't like in the old days when you had a half section of land and a few more people around didn't make too much difference. I would suggest a relaxing of the regulations in regard to people, elderly people who are living with relatives, and I'll give you my reasons. Many of these people over 70, and the lady I have in mind is over 80, living solely on the \$75.00 a month. This lady requires from time to time medical attention, but more than that she requires expensive drugs. The other day she showed me a bill that she had for 12 capsules for \$6.75. A year ago this lady made application for some assistance -- not assistance for food or rent or that because her daughter's looking after her very well -- and she was turned down because, I suppose, the daughter said she only takes \$20.00 or \$30.00 from her mother, and the social worker's report, or the report came back to say that her needs were being met.

Now this lady also manages to pay from the \$75.00 per month some \$14.50, I think it is, per quarter for MMS coverage. Now until a few years ago this lady was not able to be protected by the MMS organization and she accumulated many medical bills, and like the pioneer spirit that she has, she has been paying steadily one or two dollars per month every since trying to write off these medical bills. Well the Minister said last night that it was true that those of us who pay into MMS are paying a little more than our share in order to take care of the people who are being covered under the \$5.11 the government pays -- I think you will find that Hansard will show that -- because someone has to cover this.

Now I submit that surely a person over 80 whose sole income is \$75.00 a month should be shown a little more consideration in regard to obtaining a medicare card. Now all this lady wanted was a medicare card. She didn't require anything else because what's the point of her paying \$14.55 per quarter for medical attention when she has to go out and buy expensive drugs? She requires physiotherapy from time to time and this she cannot get unless she is hospitalized into the physiotherapy hospital, so her needs are not really being met. Now I submit that because she is struggling along like this and because she is living with a daughter who takes very good care of her, I say the younger folk are being penalized too, because I can't for the life of me see why medicare should be refused this lady.

Well it was said there are 54,000 people exempt from the Manitoba Hospital Services' premium and this lady is one of them. Now to qualify for exemption she had to convince some authority, municipal or otherwise, that she needed these premiums paid. Now I say, Mr. Chairman, if she qualifies to have her Manitoba Hospital Services' premiums paid, surely more consideration should have been given to considering her for a medicare card. It seems to me -- and I don't want to be too critical -- but in my rounds of my constituents, this seems to be a complaint. We are trying to encourage young people to look after their parents. Now had this lady's daughter declared that her mother was paying her \$50.00 or \$60.00 a month the lady would have been entitled to a medicare card, but because she told the truth, because she is doing the right thing, I say that this family unit is being penalized, and I would respectfully ask the Minister to give somewhere a little more consideration to this.

It seems to me -- and I should say too that I have had considerable requests of late, and I think the Minister would want to know about this, of people who are living on very small pensions -- the other day I was called to a gentleman's home and he was retired on pension of \$15.00 per month. Now this is a fine type of citizen. He has saved a little money and he has his own home -- very modest -- and he can see where he is going to run into trouble and his Manitoba Hospital Services' premiums are causing him a lot of concern. I advised him to consult with the municipal authorities as to whether or not they would grant an exemption to him and I believe this was done. But the point is that these people are not aware of the fact that they can get relief and these are the people we want to encourage because they are the last people

(Mr. Wright cont'd) . . . . . to ask for assistance under The Social Allowances Act. They only want the bare necessity to get along and I think we should encourage them.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced -- I probably was more critical when The Social Allowances Act was first passed, but since that time I have mellowed somewhat because I am impressed by the work of some of these people that head this department, but I would sincerely request you look into this matter of elderly people living with their youngsters.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, the member for Seven Oaks was very kind in his remarks about the staff of the department and I'm sure they appreciate his thoughtful criticisms always. This is a bit of a problem. We do recognize that there is nothing that old people cherish more than their independence, and this is one of the things that we are trying to leave with them through Elderly Persons Housing Act and through some of the other services that we are providing. I don't know really what the facts are with respect to this case. I would suggest that this lady try to keep a fairly accurate record of her expenses and re-apply at some time in the future and possibly might get favourable consideration at that time.

The problem with getting an exemption from hospital premiums -- the reason she gets that is that this is based on the old means test which is spelled out under the Old Age Assistance and which has been specified as the qualifications for premium exemption by the federal legislation and which is the criteria which we use for hospital premium exemptions. Unfortunately for medicare cards, it is based on need and it is possible for a person to qualify under a means test and not under the needs test. It's a little confusing I must confess but that's the way it works.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw four specific examples to the Honourable Minister's attention and then end up by asking, I think, two questions. The reason I have the questions, I was hoping to hear some policy expounded on social allowances, and I must say I ask this information humbly. I don't really know.

Now the first case I have that has come to my notice in my constituency is a lady, a widow with five children, who is drawing social allowance -- I guess it's called mother's allowance, I'm not sure. She receives a cheque of \$169.00. She lives in a rented house, her rent is paid by the welfare department and I believe the rent was \$70.00. She receives family allowances from the Federal Government in the amount of \$36.00. This adds up to \$275.00 per month in income into the home. I might point out net income. I would think that a man and wife with two or three children would have to earn around \$300.00 or perhaps a little over to have this kind of income come into their home.

Now when I mention this particular case I am not criticizing the set-up of the Department of Welfare, but there are some questions here that I feel should be answered. The information that I have about this case comes from a storekeeper. The first intimation he had about what was going on was he had a phone call from the Department of Welfare at Portage and he was asked to extend some credit to this lady with the understanding that she would be receiving her cheque within a month's time, and this is how this particular relationship started out.

Now unfortunately the lady in question was not capable of handling her affairs quite as well as she should have and she was imposed upon by relatives from out of town. It became known to her relatives when the cheque would arrive and they would descend like a swarm of locusts and there would be beer parties and wine bottles. The police would be called to break up rows and fights, and I know this part of it because I was on the council at the time in charge of the police department and I had I believe eight calls in two weeks from neighbors. So I referred this question to the Director of Welfare at Portage, who incidentally is a personal friend of mine and I certainly don't hold him accountable for this whatsoever, but as I understood it, he was working within certain guide lines. They were trying to get this lady on a self-sufficient basis that she could administer her own funds. But the point, Mr. Chairman, was this, that it wasn't working. The money was being wasted and wasted in large amounts, and I can back these statements up with affidavits from people who are neighbors, who know exactly what I am talking about, and from others in our city.

For instance this lady never paid a gas bill, so it came to my attention they were going to cut off the gas because she was \$50.00 in arrears. She never paid an electric bill, the same thing, \$50.00 in arrears, and this is where I entered into the case. Well I tried to help out this lady administer her cheque and I would go with her to the gas company and give them \$5.00 and

(Mr. Johnston cont'd) . . . . . stall them off until next month, and the electric company and give them \$10.00 and stall them off until the next month, but I was also asking the welfare people -- mind you this was only by phone call -- I was asking them if this was right. For instance in this particular store, this lady would buy three cans of tobacco a week, a carton of cigarettes, five or ten pounds of bananas, and when the storekeeper remonstrated with her and tried to change her habits, she went to the welfare department and told her side of the story, and after two or three of these discussions the storekeeper lost this account.

Now across the street from this family was another widow with three children. This lady had lost her husband who was a federal civil servant. She had a very modest home, I would say about \$3500 or \$4000 home. She had an \$80.00 a month pension and she couldn't, so she tells me, and I told her the place to go to apply, she tells me that she couldn't get any assistance, so she has taken a job working nights and these three children, ages 10-16, do what they want during the evening. She can't look after them. This lady is at her wits' end as to how to look after her family, but she is doing her absolute best. She has taken a low paid job because she has no training and this lady still has less income into her home than the one who is receiving full assistance.

Now as I say, I am not criticizing the concept of welfare but I am criticizing the administration that doesn't give fuller guide lines to the department or to the workers that they can't come in and step in on a situation like that instead of letting it drag on for six months or a year. Incidentally, the owner of the home finally had to get the people out. The home was ruined -- absolutely ruined -- thousands of dollars of damage done in this particular house. Now I have lost track of this case since about eight months ago, and what I speak of is a year previous to that.

Now the other case I mention is another lady receiving assistance, and I don't know the size of her cheque, but I do know that she was dealing with this same store only it was on a different basis. The store was allowed to give her \$60.00 a month worth of food and groceries, etc. and the department paid the store. Eventually, the same thing developed. She began to make unwise purchases and in one instance she caused some trouble for the storekeeper, because she would send one of her boys to the store for a bottle of vanilla four and five times in one day. Now we all know what this was, the lady was being unwise in her spending. She was having a little tax-free liquor off the First Minister I guess. Anyway, when the storekeeper tried to stop this, because in this particular instance the storekeeper can be fined for a thing like this, when he tried to stop it the upshot of this particular case again was he lost the account again.

Now I would like to know in this case, why does not the department when they are going to have people like this to deal with, and we know it has to be dealt with, we know it's extremely unpleasant, we know the social worker can't be on the doorstep day and night, why can't any store that has to -- I shouldn't say has to, but any store that is dealing with a welfare case, whether it's with a cheque or whether it's with an account that is paid by the department, why isn't that store given a set of rules -- a simple set of rules. We are not saying that people should live by bread alone or they should not have a package of tobacco, but a reasonable set of rules to go by. Why should the storekeeper be placed in the embarrassing position of ignoring it, and he knows very well that it is taxpayers' money, or condoning it. I don't think that this is right at all, and if you multiply this one storekeeper's case, who had these two cases in one year, and you multiply this across the province, how much of this is going on? How much money is going down the drain needlessly and is this really helping the people that it was intended to help? I don't think so.

Now if I could mention something in support of my honourable friend from Seven Oaks, and this is another case again where people are in very modest circumstances. The particular case I have in mind is a lady who works as a cashier in a supermarket. She supports a crippled husband who has pain that must be treated by drugs. She makes about \$45.00 per week and she has three children. As I understand it, under the rules that are set up now in the Department of Welfare there is nothing can be done for this lady. She has to buy \$20.00 worth of drugs every month for her husband and they live on a substandard existence, and as I understand it again, it's because she owns a very modest home. In this case I think the home would be worth about \$2500.00. It's out in the country; there's no waterworks, just the barest necessities of

(Mr. Johnston cont'd) ..... a home.

I would like the Minister to give us some of the policy that guides the making of the rules where people are put onto welfare, what is expected of them; what is expected for instance of storekeepers; and what can be done for these people who are trying to stay off welfare and carry themselves but they just can't do it, and when they can't do it, at the end of the month someone suffers in that home. The children do with their books, or they are ashamed of their clothing at school. This is a very sad case and I'm sure over the province there's many of these cases where people need some small assistance. Maybe it's only the drugs, maybe it's only a small grant once a year for school clothing or something of this nature. I'd be very interested in hearing the Minister speak on this.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, I would like to say a few words. The honourable member for Portage mentioned something in the way of information for storekeepers. Well, I too would like to see some information come out to the members of this House. Probably this could be done in booklet form that would include the regulations that are in effect in connection with welfare, so that when people approach us that we can give them an approximate idea or we are able to determine approximately whether they are entitled to assistance or not, and if so, then we could encourage them. However, if that was not the case, at least we would not needlessly encourage them or give them unnecessary hope of any kind that they are able to obtain assistance. I think this would be less work for the office and certainly it would be something that I would appreciate very much, because at the moment I'm personally in the dark to a number of aspects in connection with welfare. Regulations do change and we are not always aware of them, so that if we could have this, especially in connection with the Department of Welfare, some information in booklet form, it would be of great assistance.

The other point I would like to make, I would like to ask the Minister in connection with 2(c) whether he could give us a breakdown of that big figure of \$10 million I think it is. I notice from the public accounts of the year ending 1963 that the total figure at that time was \$8,072,000, and there we have four items which constitute the bulk of the \$8 million and that is ....., health service, the special care nursing homes and subsistence -- those four items. I wonder if the Minister could give us detailed information on those four items that are contained in this 2(c).

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, possibly answering the last question first, the breakdown of 2 (c) is as follows: Mothers' Allowance, \$3,033,907; Unorganized Territory Relief, \$938,400; Relief to Non-Residents in Municipalities, \$969,926; Institutional Care of Aged and Infirm, \$2,074,680; Social Allowances to Aged and Infirm not in institutions, \$1,131,552; Social Allowances to Unemployables, \$912,000; Medicare, \$1,508,260; and there's a recovery item of \$200,000 included in this making a total of \$10,368,725.

With respect to the information about Social Allowances, it is contained in the Statutes which each member has plus the Gazette, which I understand goes out to each member of the House. However, if the Member for Rhineland specifically wants a set of up-to-date regulations, I would certainly be pleased to try to get him a copy so that he could have that information for him.

The member for Portage has raised some very interesting questions. The question that seems to bother me is why aren't these complaints registered with our department so that we can take some kind of remedial action if that's necessary. Presumably, he has discussed this with his friend who is the director in Portage, however, I think there might be some value in also reporting this to the Minister because cases of abuse are things that we want to know about and I must confess are very difficult to deal with. We can't have a social worker camped on the doorstep of each recipient day and night. We do know that there are isolated cases of abuse.

However, in this case I understand that he suggested it was an administered case of Welfare? If it wasn't, the first case where there were the five children, if it wasn't administered certainly this was a case which should have been administered, at least until such time as the mother showed sufficient responsibility to be able to handle this kind of money. This is the kind of problem where giving out money isn't good enough. We have to do work with that family to try to help them to become more independent -- more responsible is probably a better word -- and one of the difficulties we face is at times to get the qualified people who can spend sufficient

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . time working with the family so that they can act in a more responsible fashion.

I don't believe that the grants are too great. I think if one calculates the food allowances, the allowances for clothing, that you realize that you have to run a pretty tight budget if you're going to get along well on it. I can't see too much frivolous spending of that kind of money unless the family suffers seriously, and of course if the family begins to suffer then we have reason to move in in cases of child neglect if we get complaints of such kind of neglect. We would be interested in hearing of cases like this if you have examples such as that in the future.

I think we do try to assess the needs of the family very carefully. We try to counsel the widow to try to utilize her resources in the best way and sometimes it's in the best interest of the family if they can remain independent, if they can get employment and maintain that family separately. In some cases of course this may result in other abuses at home and certainly we would want to have a pretty good look at cases like that before we would counsel outside employment. However, I'd be very pleased to get further information on this case as well so that we can have a look at it and just see what the actual circumstances are.

With respect to the cashier who worked at a supermarket and supported a husband, it would appear that she may be ineligible as a result of excess assets, the fact that you mentioned a farm and a home out there would seem to appear that she did have assets in excess of those which are allowed by the department to qualify for social allowances. I would think that the House would likely agree that it is reasonable that the individual should be expected to use his resources first before he calls upon public funds for the support of the family. I think this is a reasonable requirement of the department and one that I'm sure all would support.

With respect to the rules for stores, I'm not sure that any have ever existed. I'll be very pleased to take this into consideration and discuss it with the members of the department.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the two particular cases I did mention were brought to the attention of the department and this is why I asked, what authority has the director of that area to do. He knew about this, the social worker would go around at 10 o'clock in the morning or 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon, the lady would agree to everything she was told, she would co-operate 100 percent at that particular moment, but at 10:00 o'clock that night -- and I can't use a proper expression -- but all hades would break loose with these parties, and everything I say I can bear out with witnesses, neighbours, and people living on either side and across the street. This isn't an isolated instant of the one family, this went on for a month or two or three months. The police were down there time and time again.

I personally notified the department at Portage of this and I know very well that the neighbours, at my instigation, to try and get them off my neck I had them phone their complaints directly to the department in Portage. I know the social workers did their best but they couldn't be expected to stay there until one o'clock or 11 o'clock at night. There's a problem here and I think that perhaps the director on the spot should have the authority to make a quick decision and change this right then and there, not let the cheque come out of Winnipeg every month and change it a year later.

In the case of the cashier that I'm speaking about there was no farm or anything, just a small home, probably on half an acre of land. This is all. Now I fail to see, and now perhaps I'm picking an argument here, but I can't see the sense -- and I've mentioned two cases here -- we'll take the one in town where the lady got \$80 a month pension from the federal government for herself and three children and she lived in a home at most of the value of \$5,000 -- absolute most. What is the sense of that home being sold and paying \$70 a month rent for her to live somewhere else? Can not she receive some help and keep her pride of ownership and a chance of sometime getting on her feet, or does she have to go down to the absolute bottom in poverty before she gets any assistance? These two cases I believe are the same. The other case of the cashier who supported a crippled husband, why should she have to sell her \$3,000 home before she can receive some assistance? This don't make any sense to me.

MR. CARROLL: . . . . which they're living. I assumed from what you said she was not living in this home, this was a home that was away in some other part. She was living in this home? Well we really can't debate individual cases here. I think that if you would like to bring in the details of these we would be very happy to get the information for you. I regret that you haven't seen fit to send particulars of these cases to us before. Obviously this has been going

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . on for some time. I must confess that we've investigated every case of abuse that's ever come to us, and we find very few cases of abuse. I must confess there are some, and where there are we try to do something about them. I'm surprised to learn that the Director out there does not have authority to administer this particular case. I'll certainly be happy to look into it and, if he doesn't have that authority, we'll make sure that he gets it in a hurry. But I don't think we can discuss particular cases as such in this particular way.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what the policy is in regard to the lien on property of people who obtain welfare. Is it the policy of the department to put liens on this property?

MR. CARROLL: Under certain conditions.

MR. MOLGAT: What are the conditions under which liens are placed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CARROLL: In some cases where a person has excess assets, they may own a home in town, a farm or other property for which there's no immediate sale. They require assistance; they get assistance; but because they have assets then we place a lien against that property for the excess of assistance they get. There's one other case in which this applies and there may be others as well, but if a person is owning his own home and he's making payments on it, and under our regulation let's assume that we allow \$55 a month for rent but his payments on that house happen to be \$75 a month, we think it's just good sense not to require that man to sell his house. We think it's good sense for him to remain in that house but we put a lien on the house for the additional \$20 a month that he gets over and above that which is normally granted to a welfare recipient, and when the house is sold or when he is in a position to pay us back the lien is cleared off, and liens are being cleared off all the time in cases such as that.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . wrong now, but going back some years ago when my honourable friend the present Premier was sitting on this side of the House, if I recall properly, some of his aggressive speeches on this subject was that there should be no liens placed on the property of welfare recipients. I had understood that the policy, when my honourable friend took over, was that there would be no liens placed, and I assume -- in fact I believe that for a period of time there were no liens placed and recently I have been hearing about liens once again. Now was that not the policy of this government originally to do away with liens on welfare cases?

MR. CARROLL: You can understand a person having a substantial amount of property worth a great deal of money but not having an immediate sale for it, and would you think that the public of Manitoba should support that person indefinitely without attempting to recoup from very valuable property? And don't you think it makes good sense that we should try to encourage a person to stay in his own home and provide a reasonable rental value and charge him excess, which is really only charging him for the increase in value that he's getting as a result of the regular mortgage payments? We're not taking anything away from him. We think this makes good sense; we think it protects the interests of the taxpayer; and is not at all hard on the individual who is getting this kind of help on a temporary basis.

MR. TANCHAK: I just have one question and that will be last one unless I get no answer. Actually, I'm asking this question on behalf of the Honourable Member from Burrows. He's ill and is not able to do it, but I am familiar with the case. The case is a specific one but my question will not be specific -- (interjection) -- Assiniboia I meant, I'm sorry.

There was a family who moved to Westwood from Ontario. They had adopted one boy in Ontario, a young family, and they came here to Westwood, to Manitoba, and they made application to adopt another child, either a girl or a boy, they were not too particular. A letter was written to them from the department stating that they cannot accommodate this couple because there is no social worker in that area. Now to me that seems kind of senseless, and I would like to know if that is the policy that wherever there is no worker in the area, social worker, is that the policy that no applicants would be considered for adopting a child?

MR. CARROLL: I would like to say that there is no area in the Province of Manitoba that is not covered by our Child Welfare program. Now he may not be within the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, but certainly if he's not in any one of the Children's Aid Societies then he is within the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba because we handle all of those cases which are outside. Now I would like to see a copy of that letter if you have it, and be very pleased to

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . see what the difficulty is. It may be a misunderstanding about what the letter said.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . . I believe that the honourable member has one. I'm sorry I haven't got it but that's what he states. He read the contents of the letter to me by telephone and it says they cannot qualify because there is no social worker in the area. I'll pass the information to the honourable member.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . Honourable Minister did not answer, not to my satisfaction anyway, the question of the Leader of the Opposition in asking for the policy -- I think that he did state that the policy in some cases -- anyway the policy would be to have a lien if these people were receiving welfare. But I think there was another question asking if a few years ago it wasn't the policy while my honourable friend, now the Minister of Education, was in charge of welfare. There was a policy wasn't there that there would be no liens against property? I think that we should like to qualify this, was there a change of policy?

MR. CARROLL: The policy about which I speak has been in effect as long as I've been Minister of Welfare.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well all right then, if this is the answer, could I ask the Honourable Minister of Education then if this policy hasn't been changed since he was there? If I remember rightly, he stood in this House and told us that there wouldn't be -- the policy was not to have liens against the property of the people on welfare. I just want to clarify this. This is all I want.

MR. CARROLL: When The Social Allowances Act was brought in the policy of placing liens was stopped. There had been the policy for many years of placing a lien on giving of welfare assistance, especially the Mother's Allowance type of case, and this was stopped at that time and to my knowledge it was never changed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I still don't get this. He tells us that they stopped placing a lien, that the policy was stopped, and then the Honourable Minister of Welfare now tells us that, since he's been there anyway, they've had the policy of placing liens. I'd like to know which is right. I think this is important. I want to know this because if I remember right I've discussed this with the then Minister of Welfare for my information, and certainly until tonight I thought the government wasn't placing liens on the property. I just want this clear and not even a . . . . .

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think if I can add something to the debate I should in this case, because under -- just take Mother's Allowance type of case where the kind of problem arises which the Minister has referred to and which the member for St. Boniface is alluding to -- in the Mother's Allowance type of case a breadwinner dies and immediately the breadwinner dies, under our welfare legislation, the province becomes the responsible agent. Immediately the province moves in and applies The Social Allowances Act to that family. There may be a mortgage on the home and the payments, the mortgage payments for example, these are met and the regulations apply to the amount of money required for food, clothing, shelter and other items. But when the youngest child is 18 years old, as long as he's going to school and is 18, the money which is being paid into that home by way say of mortgage payments is not -- there's no lien placed against that, so when the youngest child is 18 the mother has her home and her equity in it, and previously this was not the case. When her youngest child was 18 she might have a large debt. She may be 63 years old and suddenly find herself with her children off her hands and she has a large lien against the only thing in the world that she possesses, and this was ceased.

But what you are referring to is when the husband may die or where something may happen which means the Welfare Department has to step in. If they are in a \$50,000 home, or a \$25,000 or \$30,000 home quite in excess of the needs as the department feel are average for Manitobans in this case, the immediate problems are met of food, clothing, shelter and so on, but in talking with the person, say the widow concerned, they will try and get her into a possibly less expensive accommodation if it's possible, because after all they are the custodian of public funds. I think that is the kind of case which is a difficult one -- which there are very few of -- but which arise from time to time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is this a case then that there's no set policy, that every case is studied on its own? Is this what the Minister means? I've never heard of anybody receiving welfare when they're living in a \$50,000 home. Is there -- (interjection) -- well maybe it can

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . happen. I'm not debating it, I just want the policy for my own information. Is there any set policy or is every case studied as it comes up?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . to the point where the detailed policy of the department would really become registered with my honourable friend. But I do feel that the policy is quite clear as the Minister has expressed. There is a policy of no lien, as such, in the administration of The Social Allowances Act, and especially, as I say, when you run into this with the Mother's Allowance type of case. There are those isolated cases or the odd cases which come in wherein special arrangements have to be made and I think this is clear. As the Minister pointed out, in temporary situations there may, where the breadwinner may be temporarily destitute, both the City Welfare and the Provincial Department recognizes special problems that arise in cases of that nature and gives relief where they might meet, say their mortgage payments are \$180.00 a month, they might -- I think the balance between say \$75.00 -- I'm just giving a hypothetical case of what can be authorized under the regulations as a fair amount of money for the accommodation concerned would be paid over-- they might have to pay the whole mortgage on a temporary basis. But the difference between say the \$75.00 and the \$180. mortgage would probably be placed as a debt owing these people on a temporary basis. But where the breadwinner dies, there would be to my knowledge no lien whatsoever.

MR. JOHNSON: I hate to cover old ground again but I'd like to get this clear. Coming back again to the one particular case I know of at Portage la Prairie where this widow has three children under the age of 16, she's about 45 years old and she has a very modest home and an income of \$80.00 a month pension. Now can this lady get some form of assistance or does she have to sell out, go through her money and then go on to welfare?

MR. CARROLL: The homestead, as I understand it, is never considered excess assets. If she owned that property and then owned a half-section farm out in the Portage Plains, then the half-section land would be considered excess assets and if she were getting Social Allowances there would be a lien placed against that half-section of land.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . Mr. Chairman, that it's quite impossible to deal with individual cases here. The circumstances differ and if my honourable friend will just tell the Minister at an appropriate time of his particular case it can be looked into, but I don't think it's reasonable to expect him to deal with cases in this Chamber in this way.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . take the time of the committee, but I know of three particular cases in a small area. Surely this must be an important point for all of Manitoba. Is there a policy to help a person in a similar instance as the one I've just described? If there isn't, say so.

MR. CARROLL: There are thousands and thousands of cases, Mr. Chairman, in the Province of Manitoba, and if the member felt so strongly about this I don't know why he hasn't brought it to our attention before because my office is always open to hear complaints about welfare problems, and I'd be very happy to meet with him tomorrow or at any other time to get further particulars on these cases for him.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this particular lady has applied and has been turned down. Now I've heard a suggestion that perhaps she could qualify.

MR. CARROLL: But why she was turned down I can't tell you tonight, nor can anyone in this building.

MR. JOHNSON: Do you suggest that everyone with this problem should come to your office?

MR. CARROLL: I certainly do if they feel strongly enough about it, and we have an Appeal Board to guarantee that people do get their rights under The Social Allowances Act.

MR. JOHNSON: And they have to come to your office to get this information?

MR. CARROLL: No, they don't. No they don't.

MR. ROBLIN: Let's not be childish about it. The government will be happy to deal with any case that the member thinks has been unfairly dealt with. We have the machinery and the files and the people to do it for them, but we just can't do it in here. Gives us the name of the person in the proper way and we'll do our best to look into it.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . childish. This is the place to settle these things. I know that we can't bring every individual case and all we're asking is some policy, and so far the Minister hasn't been able to tell us this. I still don't understand everything the Minister of Education

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . has said and some of the things, apparently the way I see it, he said the opposite of the Minister of Welfare.

Now I haven't any special cases but I've had people ask me and I've been giving them wrong information because I thought there was no such a thing as a lien and I want -- I'm not even making a comment, I'm not saying I'm for or against -- I'm so afraid that that will start another one, I'm just asking what is the policy. Couldn't we have the policy? I think it's just as ridiculous to send every case of people that want information from us, to send them to the Minister. I don't think that this is right either. He hasn't got the time to do all this. Just give us the policy, at least what you can, and that's all. We'll be satisfied with that. But apparently this hasn't been done. I don't think that it's wrong. The Minister said, "You're not interested." He said this three times tonight. "You're not interested because you've never said anything to me." Well this is what we're doing now, bringing cases like this. This is what we're talking about -- estimates. This is the best time to do it. You say you can't talk about one case. We're giving one case as an example. They don't come ten at once. If you don't want us to deal with one case, give us your policy. This is what I'm asking for. Give us the policy -- (interjection) -- You have? Well, I'll read Hansard tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question or two on social allowances. I believe that's the item that we're on at the present time. I'm sorry that I was out of the Chamber for a while but I'm back here now and I just caught the item that I was going to have a question or two to ask the Minister on, I don't know if anyone has asked my honourable friend as to whether or not all of the provisions of the Social Allowances Act or Social Assistance Act that we passed here, I believe back in 1958 or 1959 have now been proclaimed. If I remember correctly there was Section G that gave two unemployables of a length of his time rights for social allowances. Now I don't know if this question has come up, or if the Minister has answered it or not. If it has then I'll have to read it in Hansard. I don't want to get into a debate with the Minister. But I did ask, Mr. Chairman, for an Order for Return, asking of the number of needy persons disabled for employment for more than 90 days who had made application for social allowances, either personally or by the municipality -- the Minister's reply was 571. Now of the number who applied -- 571 -- 357 were granted social allowances. I asked the number of unemployed widows under the age of 65 years who have received aid under the Social Allowances Act. The answer was 114.

Another question I asked. The number who were rejected from receiving disability allowance but were given social allowances by the Provincial Government. The answer was 50. The other day when we were dealing with the question of elderly and infirm housing, I raised the question as to the category of people who were widows under the age of 65 -- and suggested the age of 60 -- who were ineligible to receive consideration for acceptance as tenants in our elderly citizens homes. The Minister said, "Well this is so, but there is provision in the Act whereby widows of 60 years," or under 65 I should say, "can be accommodated." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they can only be accommodated on sufferance by the Minister himself and I reject this as being a reasonable and a proper attitude for the Legislature of Manitoba to take. I don't think that those who are in the unfortunate position, under the age of 65 of our female sex should only be able to be accommodated in our homes for the elderly on sufferance of the Minister. So despite the answer of my honourable friend the other day I repeat to him that I want this looked into, and I want changes. I'm going to insist, and persist until such changes are made; until such times as there is a better deal for widows under the age of 65 in the Province of Manitoba.

A year or so ago letters were sent out, Mr. Chairman, from the Department of Welfare to the municipalities asking them to list -- that is the municipalities to list -- for the benefit of the Department of Welfare cases that they had in the municipalities of those who were considered as being unemployables and under the age of 65. I refer to a letter that was received by the gentleman in charge of the Welfare Department of the City of Transcona, dated July 8th, 1963. A letter which was sent out over the signature of the Regional Director of the Department of Welfare, indicating that, as follows: "I believe Transcona has received a letter from K. O. Mackenzie, Deputy Minister of Welfare, concerning the granting of social allowance to unemployable persons. This letter is to make contact with you about this and to extend the following information: I believe that Mr. Mackenzie explained in his original letter to you that

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . we would be dealing with applications for social allowances for unemployable persons gradually after giving priority to applicants under other parts of the Act, and to those whose eligibility for social allowances would otherwise terminate, causing their return to municipal assistance. At this time I am not certain that we will be able to handle any applications for unemployable persons currently on municipal assistance for some time. However, we will certainly deal with any on hand as soon as we are able to do so and we will give preference to those who have already been rejected for disability allowance. I enclose application forms for your use. If you have any persons to refer to this new category of social allowance to unemployable persons, will you please have them complete an application and send the applications to me. I will be directly supervising the handling of these applications during the initial period." And then the letter went on, that if they had any further questions in regard to this, kindly phone so and so. It was a very nice letter, Mr. Chairman, very politely worded and this is appreciated by myself and I'm sure that it is appreciated by municipal officials the general tenor of the letter. Now I direct a question to the Minister in view of the return, however, the answers to my return, that where in the whole of the Province of Manitoba, there are only 357 needy persons disabled for employment for more than 90 days, who have received benefits, and that there were only 114 widows under the age of 65 who have received benefits, then it doesn't seem to me that -- notwithstanding the very cordial, polite letter that was sent out -- that it has been very effective insofar as reducing from the municipal rolls the costs of aid at the municipal level and I would like to hear from the Minister further in this regard. Does he intend that this will be a continuing process? I mentioned at the offset of my remarks that I wasn't here to hear whether or not he answered the question insofar as the proclamation of the full Act. I haven't seen it in the Manitoba Gazette. I would like to hear from my honourable friend, does he intend to if he hasn't? And if he does intend to, when does he intend to if in effect he has not?

I would also like to raise a question while I'm speaking in connection with Social Allowances, Mr. Chairman, I too am interested in the question of liens of properties of those under Social Allowances. I had hoped that when legislation was changed in 1954 -- I believe it was -- that no longer liens would be placed insofar as recipients of welfare and social allowances were concerned, that this was the end of liens on recipients of social allowances. I, too, would be interested to see whether or not the department has an overall policy in this regard.

A case is being drawn to my attention -- and I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, because I haven't got the name of the parties concerned but I will submit this to the Minister if he requests the same as soon as I possibly can. I am informed that there is a widow, and one or two children, residing on eight acres and owns across the road a quarter section of land. The quarter section of land has been placed under lien by the department. A few hundred yards, or reasonable distance along the self-same highway, there is a party who's living on a quarter section of land in a home and the homestead, or the quarter section is not placed under a lien, but across the road the party owns another hundred and sixty acres which is placed under a lien. But here we have a case, in one case eight acres -- because this happens to be the area in which the residence is located -- is not under lien; across the street 160 acres is under lien. In the second case the home is located where there is 160 acres, no lien, and 160 acres across the street is under a lien. And I see by the nodding of the head of the Minister, he must know this particular case, and so Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from my friend as to policy.

There's one other matter I wish to have a little bit of an explanation and it is a case that I've had under consideration with the department. It's a rather puzzling one to me. It deals with an individual in my City of Transcona who applied to have his hospital premiums paid on his behalf. He received -- and I applied on his behalf too, Mr. Chairman -- he received a communication from the Department of Old Age Assistance Allowances Board, a rejection of his request for exemption of hospitalization premiums because in accordance with the regulations, in accordance with the regulations he was over the ceiling, which is \$1,260 being a single person. When I note the communication from the department, I note that the total income as compiled by the department is \$1,302.84, which includes an amount of five percent of the assessed value of this particular individual's property, and the communication says in parenthesis "which we are obliged to charge" and this amounts to \$42.00. If it hadn't been for

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) . . . this \$42.00 Mr. Chairman, the gentleman concerned would have only been 84 cents insofar as annual income is concerned over the ceiling for consideration for hospital premium exemptions.

Now in a communication from the department, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the co-operation between the department and myself, and I'm sure this applies to other members of the House, this co-operation from the department itself insofar as our requests are concerned, for consideration. I want to pay a compliment to the staff for the manner in which they look after our requests for assistance and the Minister himself. I don't want to overlook him. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, what I want to say is this that this particular individual made the application for exemption for hospitalization premiums -- which amount to \$24.00 a year, he being single -- and if it wasn't for this \$42.00 he'd be 84 cents over the amount, and then if we deducted the amount that he is now paying in premiums, \$24.00, actually it would be \$23.16 that he'd be actually in the hole, or eligible, but this particular individual happens to be ailing. He's over 70 now and is not in good physical condition. But in the memo that was given to me from the Honourable the Minister it mentions that he was advised to contact our department in the event of a substantial increase in drugs, in the event a substantial increase in drugs would be necessary, or his health should deteriorate to the extent he requires the care of another person. I want to use this as an illustration, Mr. Chairman, of how, because of the rigidity of the regulations, that an individual may be put into such a state of health, that not only his well-being will be prejudiced, but that additional costs may be forthcoming insofar as the department is concerned. Yesterday evening we were discussing the question of \$5.11 per month for a reasonably comprehensive medicare plan, which would cover medical, optical and drugs. Now here's an individual Mr. Chairman, who's only \$42.84 over the amount. The Minister informs me that he has told this particular individual that if his health deteriorates to such a degree that he's going to require additional drugs or medical care, or somebody else to come and look after him, then the department will reconiser.

Now I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons that this particular individual may be brought to this state, where he requires additional care is because of the fact that he has to use the last few dollars that he may have, over the amount of the level of the regulations for hospital premiums. I think these are the type of cases that we could save the state a lot of money if we provided them with medicare and hospitalization. I know the Minister is going to say to me, and possibly properly so, "Where exactly would the honourable member suggest that we draw the line as to what aid we should get?" But I do say this that the answer to him I think would be this, that where the social worker -- and I have a lot of faith despite some of the pronouncements of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, I have a lot of faith in the social workers in the Province of Manitoba -- and I would suggest, I would suggest that if the social workers who interviewed this particular individual were to say that he is of such a physical condition where we'd better set aside the restrictions and give this individual a medicare card and a hospitalization card, in the final run we will save the Province of Manitoba a considerable amount of money. In other words, what I am saying is, that it seems to me that there is a sort of a rigidity evident in this particular case that I don't think should prevail in dealing with cases.

Now I'm sure the Minister has a reply for me, Mr. Chairman. I draw this to his attention insofar as a Social Allowance case and one or two others that we have had under consideration, and I do hope, I do hope that the Minister will be in a position to say to me, that I can say to this particular individual "you will be granted a medicare card; you will be granted a hospitalization card, because we realize that while our allowances -- while you do have \$42.80 or 84 cents over and above the regulations, if we don't supply you with medicare and hospitalization, we know that we are going to have to pay a bigger bill eventually."

MR. CARROLL: . . . . can be given fairly quickly. I think he'll get his medicare card when he needs it, on our needs basis. He'll get his hospital premium exemption when the federal government decide to change their regulations, because we are administering this whole thing under the Hospital Services Plan, which has the means test as the qualification for hospital premium exemption. We don't like that word, I don't like like it any better than you do. We're stuck with it, and I'm afraid we may have to be for some period of time.

With respect to the unemployable, we are taking them over. By the end of this year we

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) . . . . . should have all of the unemployable case load in the Province of Manitoba on our welfare rolls. This will relieve the municipalities of something over \$900,000 which they have had to pay in the past. As far as any further proclamation of the Act, I think my honourable friend will just have to keep watching the Queen's Printer's bulletins here and get his information in that way. I'm not certainly in a position at this time to announce any government policy.

With respect to liens on property, we don't place liens on homesteads and that's why this one lady did not have a lien placed on her homestead property, but there was another parcel of land which was not contiguous which represented excess assets under the definition of that under our regulations, and we were required to file a lien against that property. She had the alternative of selling the other property, using that as a resource upon which to live until such time as she may have required further assistance from us but it is reasonable that people who own substantial additional property should be called upon to use those assets before calling upon public funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN; (c) passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment. My honourable friend says that I should just continue to observe the Manitoba Gazette to see the pronouncement as to the change in the regulations and the proclamation in full of the Social Allowances Act. I want to say to my honourable friend that I look every single month of the year, or every week, or whenever it is that the Manitoba Gazette comes out. I peer into this document in expectancy with each and every edition. I sincerely trust and hope that I don't have to await the proclamation coincidental with the proclamation of the dissolution of this House in order to see that the government has proclaimed Section G. I believe it is Section G of the Act, or whatever section it is. Maybe my friend the Minister can put me right.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that we proclaimed a very large and important section of that Act last year and we haven't had an election since then. I think you'll agree that since the Social Allowance Act was passed, we have been progressing through it on an orderly and regular basis and we have arrived where we are today and if my honourable friend will keep looking, one day he will get a pleasant surprise.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the fact that the Minister says that we haven't had an election for the last year. If I recall correctly the Social Allowances Act did come in just prior to an election which established the present administration as a majority government. It wasn't proclaimed at that time but we did have an election. I agree with him. I'm not going to use the phrase that I used the other day about teeny weensy steps and social allowances. I won't use that. I've used that before. But I do suggest to my honourable friend that I'm sick and tired of having to peer into the Manitoba Gazette each week, and I appeal to him to try and convince his colleagues that this should be proclaimed.

Now I don't agree with some of the statements that were made here this evening by the honourable member for Emerson, who on one hand seems to be concerned about the ever-increasing cost of welfare; on the other hand, seems to be concerned about whether some people are getting more than their just due, and others are not getting enough. I leave it to the department and its staff to make sure that those in need are taken care of, and those that are chisellers are taken to task - - and I'm sure that the department is doing this, but I do say to the Minister that he should try and use his persuasive powers on his colleagues a little bit more than he has been able to do in the past. I know that he would agree with me that maybe I'm a little facetious when I suggest that it might only be on the eve of an election when the rest of the Act is proclaimed, but maybe it's not so facetious after all when I make such a suggestion, so I ask him to get cracking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 3 . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I've been waiting for (e).

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(e).

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to recall to the Honourable Minister that during last year's estimates when he was fairly new to the department, the question was raised as to the comparative level of welfare services in the municipalities making up the Greater Winnipeg area, and I think I raised the question of the fact that they are different, there is not a standard. And then the Honourable Member from St. Vital brought a great deal of examples of a large variation in the nature of the services given and the standards given as between the different municipalities. The Minister at that time indicated that he thought -- well he stated that he didn't know the answer. He suggested that the responsibility was that of the various municipalities but that he would be glad to offer the assistance in any way he could, and stated that he would certainly like to canvass the idea and regretted then that he didn't have a positive answer. He may have a positive answer to give us tonight, in which case I'm looking forward to the reply, but I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that if I were naive enough to believe the figures which I think I read into the report of the cost -- the estimated cost of amalgamation of the Greater Winnipeg area -- if, as I say, I were naive enough to believe it, then the cost of welfare which today in the Metro area costs some \$2,174,000, would rise to \$3,100,000 based on giving the same level of service to the other municipalities that the people in the City of Winnipeg are getting. Well I know that the assumption made that a per capita distribution or allocation was the basis on which this estimate was made, this assumption being faulty in my opinion and I think in the opinion of most people who would be interested in the problem other than as a statistical exercise, would seem to point out that the discrepancies that exist between municipal services to the same type of need are very great. I know they cannot possibly be as great as this report would make it out to be, because as I say, I think the report was based on a faulty assumption which gave a distorted picture on what the cost of amalgamation would be, and I can't help but mention that because I think that it's ludicrous to let it slide by as if it were even a fair statistical assumption, but I do feel that an effort must be made to see to it that people in need are looked after on a quality which is recognized to be standard, no matter whether they live in St. Vital, or in St. James, no matter whether they are in the centre of the City of Winnipeg or on the outskirts of Brooklands, and I hoped that the Minister would be in a position to indicate to us that these standards are a matter in which his Welfare Department has been able to investigate. I think it can be fairly said that out of the 16 or 19 municipalities in Greater Winnipeg there are not more than two or maybe three which have professional services provided for this, and if it is an amateur approach which is being given to the problem by so many of the municipalities, then I think that it is a matter for the provincial department to look into. Therefore I hope that the Minister can now give us an answer dealing with the result of the canvass which he thought he would make last year.

MR. CARROLL: Well I regret to disappoint my honourable friend because I really don't have any report to make on that subject at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f) passed, (g) passed; (h) passed; Item 2 passed. Item 3, Old Age Assistance which is the (c) of that -- the first is Salaries and Supplies -- Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances and Disability Allowances, passed. Item 4, Fitness and Amateur Sport, passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question under this item of Fitness and Amateur Sport. It seems to me that it is continuing to be a department which deals with grants. There seems to me to be very little being done in the active field other than grants. I think I read of a summer school. The establishment would be -- I think I have it here -- two clerical, one administration, one field services. The Minister I think did not spend very much time in dealing with this and I am hoping that he can indicate to us to what extent there has been a growth in the program from last year, by showing us what was actually spent last year as compared to what was estimated, and what the grants are likely to be this year in terms of size and number of the \$102,000.00.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to say a word or two about the program of Fitness and Amateur Sport. I think we have made very substantial progress in that

Mr. Carroll, Cont'd.

department this year. As you may know, the department is primarily set up to encourage leadership, to encourage municipalities or other sponsoring organizations to take a more active part in fitness programs, particularly the encouragement of leadership level. Now the Member for Lakeside this afternoon asked a similar question about how much we spent during this last fiscal year. I'm happy to announce that we have spent an amount much closer to the estimates . . . provided. We did spend \$154,132.00.

There was a question raised this afternoon as well about what the expenditures were for last year. It appeared that there was a great deal of money being spent for items that were not salary items and I would like to just run through those very quickly for the information of the Member for Lakeside. There were student loans provided for in the year 1962 - 63 in the amount of \$10,000.00. That was increased in the year '63 - 64 to \$13,100.00. Grants for recreation directors, \$2,500.00 in '62-63, \$7,000.00 in '63-64. Grants to municipalities in '62-63 were only \$600.00 whereas in the past year it was \$44,376.00. There are a great many municipalities taking advantage of this program and a very substantial expansion in recreation and sports activity as a result of these grants. Provincial organization for the promotion of leadership training, in '62-63, \$7,050; '63-64, \$7,697.00. Films which would be in the nature of training films, '62-63, \$1,966 compared to \$2,998 in '63-64. Books and pamphlets -- and this is for distribution -- training pamphlets of various kinds, of various athletic activities and recreation activities, \$4,081 in the first year and \$4,453 in the second. Sports equipment, and this is for the sponsoring of clinics of various kinds, \$4,995 in the first year; \$10,551 in the second. The Gimli Course cost \$1,190 net in the first year; \$2,463 in '63-64. Advisory Council expense is \$750 and \$988.00. Wages for staff, \$14,649 compared to \$23,122.00. Leadership training clinics, none in the first year, \$2,700 in the second. Equipment for Gimli, \$5,900; none in the first year -- that was all in the second. Grants to the University of Manitoba in '63-64, \$14,000 for equipment. The reason for this is that the University of Manitoba happens to be very co-operative in allowing us and other provincial organizations to utilize their facilities for various kinds of training clinics and athletic events. I'm very happy to be able to say that the national championship of the volleyball was conducted at the university campus just a month or two ago, so that we have been receiving exceptionally good co-operation from them and intend to utilize their facilities in the future. This will be extremely helpful in helping them with their new physical education course.

There is one other matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the House. I'm happy to announce that a conference is being planned. We've had conferences in the past among recreation leaders in the province and we are proposing one for the Greater Winnipeg area to be held sometime in the near future, in which we hope to get the various community clubs together, to discuss the upgrading in standard of community club services including leadership programs, club facilities. So far investigations and the requests from community leaders indicate a need for this kind of a conference. In suburban areas in particular where the population is increasing very, very rapidly, we have a problem with varying standards, and in some cases very low standards of service in the physical recreation field. Matters that will be discussed at this coming conference will be the administration and operation of community clubs; financing club programs; fund-raising projects and things of that kind; planning programs for all ages, sexes and a variety of activities in community clubs; staffing community -- full time staff for community recreation; recruiting, training and development of volunteer leaders; examining resources available to community clubs; development and improvement in the operation and maintenance of facilities, which is one of the real problems we have in the Metro area. We're pleased with the interest that's been shown by the community club leaders in this conference and we're happy to say that many of them have agreed to accept responsibility in helping to plan and carry through this conference.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . as yet of what the recoveries will be for the year ending March 31, 1964, and could he give me an estimate as to what those -- a recent estimate as to what those recoveries will be?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think our recoveries from Ottawa were something like \$65,000. I could be wrong on that but it's very close to that figure and I understand that we hope to get within about \$40.00 or \$50.00 of that total amount, so we hope to be qualifying pretty well for the full grant with the exception of possibly a few dollars.

MR. CAMPBELL: That would mean then, and actually \$65,845 was the estimate of last year according to our estimate book, and if they achieve that then they'll be very close to their estimate in that regard, but the Minister might tell us, Mr. Chairman, if he would, as to whether they're now settled on the regular percentage of the expenditures as a recovery because the original estimate was that we would receive two-thirds of the expenditure and in the first year, as I read the Public Accounts, we didn't do that well but we did receive more than 50 percent. We spent \$65,000 odd and we got 36, almost \$37,000 of recoveries from Canada, well over 50 percent. But if the figure that the Minister gives us just now, which was shown in the estimate last year, turns out to be completely accurate then we would have expended \$154,000 odd and we would get only \$65,000 back which is considerably less than a half, so we have first an estimate of two-thirds of a recovery that turned out to be less than two-thirds, and more than a half, and now we're down to less than a half, what do we expect for this coming year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4 passed. . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: I think the Minister was going to . . .

MR. CARROLL: . . . here does deal with that point, Mr. Chairman, less recoveries from the Government of Canada \$90,000.

MR. CAMPBELL: Not greatly, but considerably less than a half.

MR. CARROLL: That is right, Mr. Chairman -- \$90,000 is less than a half.

MR. CAMPBELL: Has it settled down that this is going to be the ratio, and what has happened that we didn't get the two-thirds? This comes back to that old question of Federal Government sharing and the Minister may remember that I was my usual "Jeremiah" self and warned them of the fact that you can get Federal Government into these things and after you get into it why they may turn out to be not so generous as you thought they would be.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . introduced the budget, they had a little streak of economy there and this is one place where we got it.

MR. CAMPBELL: And that's exactly what I had prophesied. I hope I shall always be a good prophet but that it doesn't always work out to as much of a disadvantage to Manitoba.

MR. CARROLL: . . . a prophet is always without honour in his own country.

MR. PAULLEY: One question I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, of my honourable friend while we're dealing with the question of physical fitness and amateur sports. Now it's my understanding that by and large the grants were made to community centres, municipalities, for sports purposes. During the recess this year I had an opportunity of going down to Toronto, travelling Red, White and Blue with the CNR of course, mainly because of the pass. But anyway, apart from that, apart from that I had the opportunity to go down there with three carloads, or coach loads, of young boys who were representing Manitoba and the Community Clubs of Manitoba, particularly the Greater Winnipeg area, in the Bantam League down at Goderich Toronto and Brantford and other places. Now these young boys -- I believe their ages ranged from 9 to about 14 in different leagues and I might say that they conducted themselves very admirably on the train going down. It's my understanding that the parents of the boys coupled with efforts of the community clubs themselves undertook all of the expenses connected with the trip down east. I think one of the teams was either successful in winning one of the competitions or at least being in the final of the competition and thereby brought honour and glory to the Province of Manitoba. I'm wondering whether or not it might be possible in the appropriation that we have before us, whether or not a sum of money may be set aside to aid in fostering this type of venture on behalf of the youth of Manitoba into distant realms like the Province of Ontario and elsewhere in the field of sport. For after all, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, we will realize that these youngsters at the ages as I've said from 9 to 14, will be the champions of years to come and I think that it would only be fitting and proper if out of the grants for physical fitness and sports some aid could be granted to the groups of parents and community clubs that are sponsoring these trips. Now I know, I know that it may be said that at the present time this is being done purely as a voluntary effort. I would hate like the dickens to think that there is the possibility of it falling by the wayside. I think we should give some encouragement of a financial nature to ventures of this kind and I suggest to the Minister that consideration be given to that.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, it does not fall within our policy at the present time

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...although it is something we could consider in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5 passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could the Minister give us a breakdown ..... as covered under this item and .....

MR. CARROLL: .....no breakdown to it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 5 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: What is the reason for .....

MR. ROBLIN: It was in the Capital Supply Bill and has now been transferred to Current Account but it is the capital supply. It's about the same amount as last year. Roughly.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we'll ask the Minister of Mines to make part of his opening statement tonight. I think he has a rather lengthy one, and in order to expedite the business but not detain the Committee too long, I would suggest that we allow him to make the opening part of his statement and then we can adjourn and get the rest of it tomorrow or Monday whenever we begin -- Monday I think it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department IX -- 1. Administration.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, out of deference to the members of the Committee who have braved the evening's debate, who are still looking quite alive and alert, I thought I should break this statement in two and give perhaps the shorter portion of it tonight in order that the honourable members might have something to occupy their minds over the weekend. And it will be something, I hope, that the honourable members and the people of Manitoba will find enjoyable.

May I at the outset, Mr. Chairman, say just one or two words about being the new Minister and handling these estimates of a large department for the first time. I want to pay one small but very sincere tribute at the outset, and that is to my colleague the Minister of Health who, may I say, is an extremely difficult man to follow. He has done outstanding work in the Resource field in Manitoba. He has a reputation in this province and indeed in Canada for the work that he did while he occupied this portfolio. He has many friends in the field of resource development in Manitoba and in Canada, and I would like to say that many of the projects that I will be dealing with in the course of these opening remarks were projects which were initiated in the department while he was leading that department and I wish to pay him this personal tribute which I know will be shared by many in the House, for the work that he did while he was Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

Mr. Chairman, breaking the statement in two, I would like if I may tonight to deal with the aspect of it that concerns itself with recreation and development of that nature in the Province of Manitoba. In recent years Manitobans in unparalleled numbers have taken to the outdoors in their free time. This trend toward outdoor recreation is continent-wide and is growing. So great in fact has been the movement to the out-of-doors that in the United States a special Presidential study was made of the situation. They documented in their elaborate study what we have found by counting heads at park entrances in Manitoba. More and more families are spending their holidays, their leisure time, outside. Here in Manitoba our parks people estimated a 30 percent increase in the number of visitations to provincial parks and recreational areas in 1963. Our campgrounds were almost groaning under the pressure of more and more tents in the last year when almost 25,000 more persons camped than in the previous year. The increase is even more impressive when we note that for every one camper in Manitoba ten years ago there were 16 campers last year. Day users, that is, those people who drive to a beach in the morning and drive home again at night, have also swelled in their ranks and the trends all indicate that this is the facet of recreation use which is most rapidly increasing. In fact their visits to places where we do keep records jumped by 51 percent only last year. On almost any one of the big five or six midsummer weekends you could expect to see over 120,000 people thronging into Grand Beach, St. Malo and Rivers, Norquay and Patricia Beach and into the Whiteshell and the Duck Mountains, 120,000 Manitobans and tourists.

By way of comparison, Mr. Chairman, the number of people in these places that I have just mentioned on a summer week-end, would be equal to the total population, men, women and children, of Brandon, Portage, St. Boniface, St. James, Dauphin, Flin Flon, Selkirk and Transcona, all in one week-end, all enjoying their leisure time in provincial recreation spots. There is no evidence or reason to believe that this mass movement is going to stop. It would

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...be foolhardy to expect that it will do anything but increase and increase substantially. The United States expects its population to double by the year 2000 and the demands for outdoor recreation will probably triple by that time. Canada and Manitoba can expect the same demands. Indeed, we can probably expect greater ones, because in addition to our own people, there will be an increasing influx of tourists from over-crowded American cities coming up to Canada.

I emphasize the United States in this, because from their bitter experience we can learn one important lesson. We can, and we will develop outdoor recreation areas now and not wait until we are overcome by pressure. By developing now we can avoid having to buy back the necessary land at highly inflated prices, the way they are doing in many United States areas at the present time. We recognize now the desire of the young and active population to spend much of its free time in outdoor activities, and we have built a strong, province-wide centennial program of park development on the basis of this need, and it is this program which I should like to outline to you tonight.

Mr. Chairman, as part of this program and as the highlight of this program, three major parks will be developed in the Province of Manitoba starting during the fiscal year. One of these parks, the first, will extend over the slopes of Birds Hill right next door to the heavy demands of Greater Winnipeg's half million population. The second park will cover some 57,000 acres of the Assiniboine Valley land in the spruce woods of Southwestern Manitoba. The third of these three new provincial parks will be developed around the Shellmouth River Water Conservation reservoir. In total they will cost between now and 1967 almost \$3 million. The total capital parks program for that period is estimated to be in the area of some \$5 million to start taking account of this need that we have been discussing earlier. They will provide, we hope, a rich and diverse fare of recreational facilities for Manitobans. In a growing industrial province they will provide some of the woods, and fields and streams so necessary for pleasure and indeed for inspiration. Now I would like Mr. Chairman, to give a few more details about these three major parks that I have just mentioned.

The Provincial Park closest to Winnipeg will be located adjacent to the east bank of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. Its 9,300 acres over the Birds Hill slopes offer a wide range of natural conditions suited to a variety of recreational, cultural and educational purposes. The park will be 14 miles approximately from downtown Winnipeg and will provide day-use opportunities not now available in any of the municipal parks of Greater Winnipeg. Complete development is planned now to take place in three stages, the first stage to be completed by 1967 to help us celebrate the Centenary of Canada. This will include construction of a 20 acre artificial lake suitable for many aquatic events. The park will also provide tent and trailer facilities, large playing fields, picnic sites and landscaped area. Ultimately it will offer hiking, riding and nature trails and winter playgrounds as well.

The Sprucewood Park will be developed around three oxbows in the Assiniboine River. These are Marsh Lake, Jackfish Lake and the De Geldre's Lake. Marsh Lake will serve as the key site for large scale, day-use picnic and beach areas and camping facilities. The other two lakes will be semi-primitive camping picnic areas, isolated from commercial services. Both the north and south blocks of the park will have wide appeal to hikers, amateur naturalists, botanists and photographers. There will be interesting and exciting areas for hiking and riding trails.

The third major park in our program centres around the Shellmouth River Reservoir, a reservoir that will be 45 miles in length, of which 25 miles will be in Manitoba. This park will be closely tied in to the water facilities available from the reservoir and will offer boating and fishing opportunities that are non-existent in the area at the present time. This park covering a 5,500 acre area will include both escarpments of the Assiniboine River on the fore bay and all lands in the escarpments of the Shell River Valley, easterly to Public Trunk Highway 83. The park will include a camping area, beach and marine services, picnic areas and hiking trails. If a local demand develops, there are also opportunities for winter sports development.

These three parks each developed with a different purpose in mind, will be able to accommodate on completion probably 63,000 people per weekend. This is about half the accommodation provided by the seven areas that I mentioned earlier which took care of some 124,000 people on week-ends last summer.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...

Well now Mr. Chairman, before proceeding I should like to pass out to members of the committee, copies of a highlight map of the province, showing our existing parks, marked with a triangle; showing the three new parks, marked with a black circle, so that honourable members can have some visual idea of how this park program, the three new parks will meld into the existing parks that we have, which I should mention -- the Whiteshell Provincial Park, Grand Beach Provincial Park, Turtle Mountain Provincial Park, Duck Mountain Provincial Park, Clearwater Lake Provincial Park and Grass River Provincial Park. You will see as these maps are distributed to you, how the total park development program of our province will now swing around through the whole of the populated areas of our province to provide recreational opportunities for people in the major population centres, whether they be in the south, the west, the north, or wherever.

Mr. Chairman, we are not stopping with the development of these three parks and we cannot, because if we do, we are going to be in trouble. I said earlier that the total proposed capital parks program for the years 64-67 was about \$5 million, about \$3 million will go to the three new provincial parks but the rest will be spent on major expansion programs in existing parks; new facilities, area expansion and re-development within existing recreational areas; the establishment of nature trails and heritage areas; planning and survey studies and this will all be again part of the centennial contribution by the province to park and recreation centres for the people of Manitoba.

This expansion program will concentrate on new camping facilities and improved day use facilities. The Grand Valley, Norquay and Patricia Beach recreational areas will get increased campgrounds. At Rivers and Lynch's Point the beach facilities, such as washrooms, will be improved. A substantial expansion will be made of the St. Malo Recreational area. This area is now only 10 acres in size and it has supported throngs of up to 5,000 on a week-end. We plan to add between 160 and 200 acres to the area for dispersed day-use facilities. The Whiteshell, of course, has been the backbone of the Provincial Park system and because of its location on the Trans-Canada Highway, and its proximity to Winnipeg, it will continue to get increased use. We propose to extend the road network to connect up with several other northern lakes where development will be designed to preserve the wilderness atmosphere. Any further intensification of summer cottages and public use in other areas of the park would destroy the quality of the park which people now prize.

A new campsite of 160 units will be built at Barrier Bay along the Winnipeg River, and 40 unit trailer sub-divisions are planned for Dorothy and Betula Lakes. General ground improvements are planned, together with improved facilities at Whitemouth Falls, Otter Falls and Dorothy Lake sites. The big Whiteshell campsite and White Lake campsite, both extremely popular, will be expanded this year. At West Hawk Lake, one of the Province's best known sites, we plan to expand the campsite for tents and trailers. Minor extensions are also planned for Toniata Beach and Caddy Lake. At Falcon Lake, which is recognized as one of the finest resorts in Western Canada by week-end crowds of up to 20,000 people, we plan to expand the camping facilities by developing a new 165 unit campsite. A 68 unit addition will be made to the trailer court. The lawn bowling green and miniature golf course started last year will be completed.

We also plan major improvements to sub-division roads and we are going to assure the continuance of public utilities by getting stand-by diesel generator to take over if a storm caused a power failure.

The closest rival to Falcon Lake last year, in terms of day-use by Manitoba people was Grand Beach. Only 60 miles from Winnipeg, the Beach accommodated up to 17,000 people on a week-end. Between now and 1967 we plan to spend better than \$3/4 million providing new facilities at this popular resort. These will include access to the area east of the lagoon, where we plan a 1,000 unit campsite, an 18 hole golf course, riding, hiking and nature trails, sports grounds and commercial accommodation. We will also provide access to the mile-long beach which is now isolated by wet land. As well we plan a deep boat channel to connect the lagoon to Lake Winnipeg. This will offer a sheltered harbour for all classes of pleasure craft. New washrooms will be put up this summer, as well as a new beach pavilion which will provide such badly needed services as a food bar. Four new beach dressing rooms will be built and spaced

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... in such a way as to give the beach users better access to the beach.

You can well imagine, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that with 17,000 people in the area, problems arise with lost kiddies and so forth. We plan to set up a portable transistorized radio and beach telephone system which will facilitate better beach supervision and aid to the public. It will also enable the public to call for assistance more easily. This is the type of thing that is happening right under our eyes, and under our very noses today in Manitoba with this tremendous pressure of use, particularly day-use on our resort facilities, that we have to take such action as we can to insure safety for people, comfort for people, when they come in such vast numbers as they do to these areas.

Now having spoken of the southern, and particularly the eastern areas, I should mention immediately the western and northern areas of Manitoba, which certainly are not being forgotten in this expansion program. Work will continue on campsites in the Duck and Porcupine Forest Reserves. In the Grass River Park we plan between now and 1967 to build picnic and rest areas on selected islands along the boating waterways, which we will mark. Some re-development work is planned for Cranberry Portage recreational area. In the Clearwater Provincial Park we will by 1967 modernize and expand the existing campsites and beach. Improvements will also be made at Sunset Beach, Pioneer Bay, Bakers Narrows, Blondy Beach, Berge Lake, Wekusko Falls and Paint Lake. At the present time we have 65 waysides serving the public along our highways. These range from simple driveways with shaded picnic tables to fairly elaborate grounds with camping facilities. Anyone who drives about the province knows how much these areas are utilized and how welcome they are when you want to let the children out of the car to run for awhile and perhaps to get a rest yourself. Two or more of these waysides will be built this year at points as yet not selected by the Parks Branch.

I may say here that the maintenance budget for our parks and waysides is up substantially from last year. It will be better than \$1/2 million. To be exact, \$559,285 in the current fiscal year, an increase of some \$91,000 over last year. Most of this is due to increased operational costs but some will be spent on special planning studies of both an office and field variety. In all cases they are essential to a planned and useful program of development. All of these programs, Mr. Chairman, which I've just discussed involve fairly big acreages and are used by large numbers of people at once but it is important for us to remember that recreation is a different thing to different people. To some it is boating and to others it is swimming; to still others it may be just looking at an interesting wild flower. We plan to accommodate some of these less common kinds of recreation by setting up what might be called heritage areas. Here we will save and preserve some of the important features of the land and its settlement and use pattern, and at the same time provide interesting things for people to see and for people to do. Our heritage areas will include such things as buffalo rubbing stones and old Indian encampments and historic river crossings or prairie trail junctions, and of course unique ecological formations such as original prairie grass. These areas will generally be fairly small but they will be distinctively marked and eventually they may be tied together by a tour route system enabling Manitobans to get a better appreciation of our history and of our physical environment.

Among Manitoba's important physical features are our great waterways. They have had an impact on our recreational program. We find that Manitoba now ranks fourth in all of Canada in pleasure boat registration. Our waterways are probably second only to the Great Lakes as a water recreational resource. Safe harbours along the Red River and on Lake Winnipeg will probably increase the use of these waterways and we plan to study two sites this summer as possible marine parks. If they live up to expectations, construction on them will start next year. A marine park, as we visual it, will consist of a sheltered anchorage, marina services, on-shore camping and picnic facilities. One of these may be at the mouth of the Red River where the less experienced boater can go. The second may be on Black Island in Lake Winnipeg where we would hope to provide facilities for larger craft and more experienced sailors. But I stress that these are future plans, future expectations only at this time, subject to further study.

It is also our intention to develop a wilderness area during this four-year program. There are many definitions of wilderness area. Some people define such an area as one where there is no development, no fire-fighting, no low flying, no outboard motors. Our area will likely be a compromise with this rigid standard that some folks have set. If we compromise

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)...it will have been dictated by the hazards of forest fires. To let a large wilderness area burn at will would be a serious danger that we could probably not justify, so the wilderness area will probably not be quite as raw as some would envision it but certainly it will be as untrammelled by commercialism and by signs of humanity as is possible. In any event we have had canoe parties out in the area east of Lake Winnipeg, as an example, exploring the possibilities in that area and we will continue our search for a good wilderness area in Manitoba. This is a specialized use of our resources and it is important for those people who are looking for a new challenge and a complete break with the relatively soft living of this generation.

.....continued on next page.

(Mr. Lyon cont'd) . . . .

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is our program in the recreation field. It covers the recreational field from camping grounds and beach facilities to major trails and beauty spots, from spots rich in the traditions of our history to facilities in our great waterways. I would like to close by saying a few words about why this program is so broad and diverse, and so big. I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that our population is growing. Most of the growth will take place in urban areas. This fact alone is of real significance to recreational planning. The industrial worker faces a future of shorter work hours, more money, better cars and better roads. In short, he will have more leisure and more money to spend in using that leisure. Indeed some experts think that leisure and its most constructive use will be one of the great problems in North America in the decades lying ahead.

I needn't emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that people need some form of recreation if their lives are to be relieved of the stresses and strains of modern living. Maximum efficiency in business and industry can be achieved only when workers come to their jobs relaxed and renewed in spirit by some kind of recreational activity. Outdoor activity is only one of the many forms of recreation, but it is the fastest-growing and the one with which we here are concerned. Outdoor recreation, of course, covers a broad area. It ranges from municipal parks containing such things as zoos right up to our big national parks. Manitoba has assumed responsibility for provincial parks, recreational areas, waysides, heritage areas, wilderness areas and canoeing waterways. In the case of provincial parks we find that outdoor recreation is one of the leading products of our natural resources. The parks are themselves closely integrated with the management of lands, forests, fisheries, wild life and water. Most of the resources come under the stewardship of this department and this ensures that they and the parks can be managed under multiple use principles. We intend to provide, Mr. Chairman, as best we can, outdoor recreational facilities that preserve the qualities and atmosphere of our natural environment. We intend to tightly control the introduction of urbanizing influences unless there are special circumstances requiring it. In general we favour developments that emphasize participation rather than spectator enjoyment of recreational activities. We will continue to try to design programs for the benefit of the greatest number of people. Uses which require exclusive private occupancy will only be granted when present and future public needs are protected. Ordinarily preference in park development will follow the doctrine of the greatest good for the greatest number, and day use activities, as I mentioned at the outset, is one of the spiralling uses that we have of our recreational facilities today. Winter sports areas are fast-growing and a secondary need for development. Organization camps a third; commercial resorts a fourth; and strangely enough to many people, down at the bottom, fifth, summer home sites, limited clubs and other similar uses. These are at the bottom of your recreational uses according to the development plans that we have, because they do not, of course, provide recreation or leisure for the greatest number of people.

Outdoor recreation in Manitoba has grown from the days when it was considered to be the privilege of the privileged, to today when most of our residents use one or another of our facilities at some time during the year. Most people no longer work from dawn to dusk. They can now make an easier living. We hope, and we hope fervently, Mr. Chairman, that our parks and recreational areas will help to make their leisure living more enjoyable and more useful. Spare time activities can enrich, broaden and develop an individual's life and help fulfill his natural desire for a more rewarding and satisfying existence. Outdoor recreation can help him to reach this goal. Our park staff under the able and imaginative direction, may I say, of Mr. Walter Danyluk, the head of the branch, bears this goal in mind as it plans for the future. Mr. Chairman, our parks are being built for our people to use and to enjoy. The broad and diverse program that I have just outlined tonight was developed in answer to the needs and desires of the people of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I hope to be able to continue this statement when the Committee next meets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the report of the committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before we adjourn, I wonder if I could give notice that we will be moving the first reading of an Act respecting the Registration of Business Names and Partnerships, and an Act respecting the Laws of Partnerships on Monday. They don't appear on the Votes and Proceedings of today as they should, so I'd like to have permission to give notice now that they will be given first reading on Monday. I would also think that it might be advisable that we adjourn until 2:30 Monday afternoon. It may be that the committee work tomorrow will prove lengthy and we may have to have further meetings, and perhaps we should reserve Monday morning for that, so I would propose that we adjourn now until 2:30 Monday afternoon, seconded by the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I have no objection to the bills proceeding as the First Minister indicates. I would like to say, however, that in reply to a question I believe yesterday or the day before the Minister had indicated that there would be no further major legislation and we have received today on our desks three or four new bills and we are now advised of two more. Is there more legislation still to come?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, perhaps I was misunderstood or at least I may have misunderstood the question. When I was answering the other day I thought I was talking about bills to which no notice whatsoever was given. The ones that my honourable friend refers to had been given first reading, I think, and therefore I sort of excluded them from my mental calculations. I believe that there is one other bill -- no, the Education bill's been moved today. I don't think we have any other bills to advise the House of at this session, with the exception of one more which is under consideration and which my honourable friend knows something about.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, as far as I am concerned I'm prepared to grant leave to waive the rights of notice as far as the Votes and Proceedings of the bills which my honourable friend has mentioned so that they can be introduced for reading on Monday. I believe he made this request.

I have a request, however, Madam Speaker, that I'd like to make to my honourable friend. So far we have -- despite the fact that we did pass the resolution dealing with the speeding up of the House, that each sitting shall be a separate sitting, we have been continuing the sitting that has started at 2 o'clock or 2:30 in the afternoon throughout the day, and we have not actually gone into the arrangement that is made as a result of the resolution, namely each sitting be a separate sitting, whereby you, Madam Speaker, come in at 5:30, adjourn the House and then start out again at 8:00 o'clock. This has been, as far as I'm aware, the method used in the past. Now then, I have this comment to make on the manner in which the House is being conducted at the present time. We have on the Order Paper two or three resolutions of very prime importance -- two that I will use as examples, Madam Speaker. One is the one dealing with the Report of the Livestock Committee; the other is the resolution dealing with the shared services as proposed by the Honourable the First Minister. Now I fear greatly, Madam Speaker, greatly and frankly, that under the method of procedure at the present time we are going to arrive at the stage where we are going to have exhausted, generally speaking, government business of the nature of the estimates, and will be going into Capital Supply, but I fear greatly that we are possibly going to reach a stage where there will be a continuous succession of speeches -- and I'm particularly concerned with the one dealing with shared services -- one after the other, rather than the normal procedure of adjournment from day to day.

If I may by leave continue, Madam Speaker, I note that insofar as the resolution dealing with shared services, that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has the adjourned. I know that at least one of my colleagues and myself, so far as the New Democrats are concerned, wish to make a contribution to this debate. It may be, Madam Speaker, that other members of the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party may want to take part in this discussion. Now I don't think that it would be proper or right that the resolution should be dealt with in such a nature that there would be a considerable number of contributions to the debate having to be made one after the other at the tail end of the session, so I would suggest to my honourable friend that he may give this matter consideration, so that we do conduct the proceedings of the House next week in accordance with the resolution that we adopted, in that each sitting will be a separate sitting and that the resolutions which I consider of prime importance, namely that of livestock and that of shared services, may be called ahead of, say, the completion of the estimates of the

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) .....

Department of Mines and Natural Resources and before we go into Capital Supply. I think this would be only fair and reasonable, Madam Speaker, so that we don't have at the tail end of the session a continuous number of contributions to these two important debates, and I ask consideration be given to this matter.

MR. FROESE: I am quite agreeable to the request of the First Minister. However, if there should be more bills introduced I would like to get notice of them too.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... take the point of view expressed by the Leader of the NDP. I hope we won't conduct our business in an unseemly manner. These two resolutions have been before us for some time and I rather fancy everybody who wants to speak has a pretty good idea of what they are going to say, and that we may have a reasonable chance to conduct the debate in which I think most good debates are conducted, and that is that we have a succession of speakers who are prepared to take part in the discussion, but I'll keep my honourable friend's point in mind and I hope we will be able to finish all our business with decorum and with a proper consideration of the importance of the topics involved.

Madam Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. PAULLEY: ..... while I agree with the Honourable the First Minister, the fact still remains however, that the resolutions to which I make reference have not been called for the last four or five days.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.