

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 A.M., Tuesday, May 4th, 1965.

Opeaing Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 132, an Act respecting the Taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by The City of Winnipeg and to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, for second reading. MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I think the Honourable Members of this House are quite familiar with the background of this matter, how in the early 1880's the City of Winnipeg requested this Legislature to validate certain by-laws which gave the CPR an exemption in perpetuity from taxation on its railway properties and properties used in connection with their railway function.

In the 1940's there was a very interesting court case when the City tried to subject the railway to full taxation and that court case was decided by the Supreme Court of Canada in favour of the railway. Pressures continued however and in 1954 the railway entered into a contract with the City of Winnipeg for a period of 10 years whereby the railway company would pay to the City a grant in lieu of taxes of \$250,000 per year. This agreement expired at the end of 1963.

At the session of the Legislature last year the City presented a bill which would take away the perpetual exemption and over a period of years gradually increase the taxation of the CPR to full taxation. The CPR objected strenuously and honourable members who were present in Law Amendments Committee will remember that at that time the Premier requested the parties to continue negotiations in the hope that some agreement might be reached as to how this controversy could be settled. The CPR agreed that they would pay the \$250,000 grant in lieu of taxes for the year 1964 and we are informed that negotiations did continue.

In January of this year the parties met with the Premier and myself and advised that they had been unable to reach agreement. One of the parties had suggested that a mediator be appointed to assist in the negotiations but they had been unable to agree either to the appointment of a mediator or as to who should be appointed. When they met with the province, the suggestion was made that the province should appoint a mediator and that we should have one further try at settling this dispute. The parties agreed to this and W. J. Johnston, Q.C., the Chairman of the Municipal Board, was appointed as mediator early in February with the request that he get the parties together and attempt to reach some settlement in this matter. He was also instructed to report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs within 60 days.

He did report to me in April and his report read as follows: "Further to my letter of March 4, 1965, I regret to report that the parties have been unable to agree to a solution of their differences on the question of taxing railway properties. During the negotiating period I met with the parties separately on some 16 occasions, and while all our discussions were most helpful and informative, their respective points of view were sharply divergent. Finally, on March 24, 1965, I wrote to each of the parties putting forward two proposed settlements for their consideration. A copy of the substance of those letters is enclosed for your information. Unfortunately, it was not possible to reach agreement on either of them and I am of the view that a prolonging of the negotiations would be unlikely to serve any useful purposes. Yours very truly, W. J. Johnston."

The letter which he had sent to the parties and a copy of which was enclosed read as follows: (This copy that I have is the one that was addressed to His Worship, Mayor Stephen Juba. I am informed that the copy that was sent to the Vice President of the CPR was identical in all respects except for the address) "We have now met on several occasions and while all our discussions have been most helpful and informative it is unlikely that further meetings will serve any useful purpose. So that the parties will not in any way be prejudiced I would propose

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)..... at this time that each give consideration to the settlements which are outlined below and notify me of their acceptance or rejection in each case. The replies will be kept in strict confidence and no decision will be revealed except at the request of the party making it or unless each of the parties has signified his acceptance of either or both of the propositions. In these circumstances your decisions must be authoritative and binding. Proposition 1: That the parties enter into a new agreement with such detailed provisions as may be settled by their respective counsel to give effect to the following basic principles: 1. That effective the 1st day of January, 1965 City by-laws numbered 148 and 195 and Chapter 64 of the Statutes of Manitoba 1883 be repealed, and any right, privilege, obligation, liability, or municipal tax exemption acquired, accrued, accruing or incurred thereunder be deemed to have expired, ceased and determined as of that date. 2. That in respect of all municipal taxation and all of its properties and not otherwise provided for in paragraph 3, 4, and 5, the railway pay to the City in each of the years 1965 to 2,004 that percentage of full taxation that applies in accordance with the following table: 1965 to 1972, 50 percent; 1973 to 1980, 60 percent; 1981 to 1988, 70 percent; 1989 to 1996, 80 percent; 1997 to 2004, 90 percent. For the purpose of this paragraph, full taxation means the tax computed pursuant to The Municipal Act except that the rates for business tax shall not exceed 10 percentum of the assessed annual rental value in the case of hotels and 12 1/2 percentum of the assessed annual rental value in the case of other premises that would be payable on all railway property. 3. That the provisions of the 1954 agreement in respect of full taxation be continued where applicable. 4. That the provisions of the 1954 agreement in respect of local improvement charges be continued. 5. That in respect of new properties acquired by the railway after the date of the agreement, those which are used for railway purposes or in connection therewith, be subject to taxation as provided in paragraph 2, but those physically detached from the present railway property which are not so used (such as a new hotel) be subject to full taxation under the City Charter from the beginning. Where in respect of any such newly acquired property the parties cannot agree as to whether it is used for railway purposes or in connection therewith, the matter shall be referred for decision to a board of arbitration consisting of an independent chairman and one arbitrator appointed by each of the parties and the decision of the board be final and binding on the parties. 6. That the parties join in applying to the Legislature of Manitoba for such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the agreement. Proposition 2: That the parties enter into a new agreement in all respects similar to the 1954 agreement but providing for an annual payment by the railway to the City of the sum of \$350,000 rather than \$250,000, this agreement to run for a term of ten years commencing with the year 1965. I appreciate that the proposed settlements represent major concessions by both parties but they do appear to be a reasonable compromise of the widely divergent views held by each. In the circumstances I would urge you to give them your careful and earnest consideration as time is running short. Would you be good enough to let me have your decisions at an early date, Yours very truly, W. J. Johnston".

The Bill that is before the House was drafted and is in all respects a reflection in legislation of proposition one, outlined in the letter of the mediator dated March 24. Subsequently on April 23, I received the following letter from the mediator addressed to myself, "Re: City of Winnipeg and Canadian Pacific Railway. Further to my letter of April 14, 1965, I have been requested by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to release to you the railway decision with respect to the propositions contained in my letter of March 24th, 1965. Accordingly I am enclosing herewith copy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company letter to myself dated April 13th, 1965, which copy is self-explanatory."

That copy reads as follows -- from the office of the Vice President, Prairie Region, Canadian Pacific Railway, Winnipeg 2, addressed to W. J. Johnston, Chairman of the Municipal Board, dated April 13th, 1965, "re CPR Taxation. I refer to your letter of March 24th outlining two propositions for settlement of this matter. Proposition 1, eventually takes away completely from Canadian Pacific the major benefit it contracted for, and leaves the City with continuing benefits. While we have always considered it would be inequitable to impose full taxation on Canadian Pacific, nevertheless, in order to achieve a settlement which will avoid further controversy the company will accept proposition 1. Proposition 2 on the other hand will not avoid further controversy and moreover the company considers the amount proposed too high and the term too short. Accordingly proposition 2 is not acceptable to the company. I wish to add that Canadian Pacific appreciate the efforts you have made to bring about settlement and the sincerity and frankness you demonstrated in the discussions Mr. Picard and I had with you. Yours very truly, signed D. M. Dunlop, Vice President." Madam Speaker, I would like to table the correspondence in this matter.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): I wonder Madam Speaker, if at this juncture may I ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs in addition to tabling it, whether copies might be made available to us so that we may have the opportunity to read the same.

MR. SMELLIE: It will all be in Hansard Madam Speaker. Is it necessary to make -- the clerk can make copies for any person who desires them.

MR. PAULLEY: Hansard takes quite a while sometimes to get on our desk. We're moving so quickly these days, we don't

MR. SMELLIE: Well I think arrangements can be made for copies for any member who asks the clerk for same.

Madam Speaker, at the present time the CPR is paying to the City of Winnipeg \$250,000 each year. Under the bill that was proposed last year by the City of Winnipeg, in 1965 the CPR would be required to pay \$350,698.70. Under the bill which is before you now the CPR would be required to pay \$332,240.88. Over the period of 40 years, which is the period that would be required under this bill to reach full taxation, under the present arrangement of a quarter of a million dollars a year, the CPR would pay a total of \$10 million in taxes to the City of Winnipeg. Under the bill as proposed last year by the City they would pay a total of \$23,755,222.44. This is based on 1965 assessment and 1965 mill rates. Similarly, calculated under the bill which is before you now, they would pay a total over the 40 year period of \$18,605,489.12.

The Bill which is before you was the proposal of the mediator. It is in my view a reasonable compromise between what is asked by the City and what the CPR have claimed as their right. Under this proposal the CPR will pay roughly \$6,600,000 more than they were prepared to pay under a negotiated settlement. They will pay approximately five and a half million dollars less than the City requested in the proposal that they made last year. I believe this is a reasonable compromise. I believe also that in the interests of Manitoba that it would be unthinkable for us to consider a unilateral action to cancel a contract on behalf of one of the parties to that contract. The letter of the CPR to the mediator has indicated that they accept this cancellation of their rights gained by contract in the 1880's. I therefore recommend this proposal to this House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, the Minister has tabled the correspondence between the mediator and the CPR. Has he also correspondence between the mediator and the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker.....

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'm asking a question and I'm not -- I hope the Minister is not closing the debate at this moment.

MR. SMELLIE: In the answer to that question, you will remember the letter from the mediator to the parties said that their answers would be confidential unless the parties requested that they be made public. I must take it from the fact that he has not made the City's answer public, that they have not given him authority to do so. The CPR did specifically request him to release their answer to me and in view of that I have received their answer, but I believe that the City of Winnipeg's answer was confidential to the mediator. I have no idea of what was said.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, perhaps we could ask the Honourable Member for Hamiota to move the second reading of Bill 104, on the last page of the order sheet.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota) presented Bill 104, an Act to provide for the disposition of the funds of Weather Modifications Ltd. for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, will there be an explanation from the honourable member?

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, Weather Modifications Ltd. was incorporated to carry out weather modification operations, weather modification research and weather modification analysis. During the years 1953 to 1958 they carried on this operation and they received funds by way of grants from various persons and organizations. Inasmuch as they have ceased

(MR. STRICKLAND cont'd).....operations from 1958; and also inasmuch as the record books and so on have been lost and various members of the organization cannot be located, the group held a meeting in February of this year and they have decided that they should disband. They want to dispose of the funds and this is the only method in which it can be done, due to the loss of records and inasmuch as certain persons that were part of the organization cannot be found. The funds after all accounts have been met, they wish to turn over to the Brandon College Incorporated Building Fund.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I think that the action of the group is very commendable and I'm sure that Brandon College will be very pleased to receive these funds. I presume that we are to assume then that the Weather Modifications company were unable to modify the weather. Is that the basis on which they ceased operation. This was I recall an attempt that was carried on in a number of areas at that time and I assume that it was not a workable scheme. Is that correct?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, not having the background that the Leader of the Opposition has in this matter and knowing very little about rain-making, as I suppose this could well be termed, I would like clarification on whether this was a privately-owned company or one owned for the benefit of various municipalities. There's indication that money was provided by persons and organizations. I don't know whether public funds were invested in this from the explanation, whether it was municipal or other funds, I'm also not clear on whether there were private investments made, whether there were shareholdings and whether the books and records which are lost would have revealed the vested interests of individuals. In the event that there are such, should not some advertising have taken place to attempt to obtain information as to investments by individuals, or is it unnecessary because this was in effect a public non-profit corporation? Neither the preamble nor the explanation clarifies these issues and I think that we ought to know them so that we can make sure that the rights of individuals are being protected.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, many people consider that their operations of course were successful in many respects. In fact, if I remember correctly in one particular year it was too successful because I believe they were flooded out. Nevertheless, the group have not been in operation for a number of years. The original organizer I believe is from the United States. That particular party I understand cannot be located.

As for the Member for St. John's, he is asking me certain questions that I believe would be better answered, more capably answered at Committee stage rather than by myself at this time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, could we now proceed if you please with the debate on the constitution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to apologize to honourable members of the House for having this matter stand on several occasions. I find it difficult to do some of my homework when we have three sessions a day and this is one reason for it. In connection with this resolution before us a person has to do some reading in order to be informed on the matter, and I still would have liked to do more reading to be better informed than I am at the present time. However, not to keep the matter on the Order Paper any longer, I wish to convey a few thoughts of my own on this matter before us.

I think this is a very important resolution that we're dealing with at this session. It seems to me that this is going to be a one-time proposition and that this is the only time in the history of Canada probably that we as a Province and as a Dominion will ever be dealing with this matter, that is of domiciling The British North American Act, and to provide for the amending of same once it's been patrioted. The constitution as such in my opinion acts like a policeman, it's there to protect us, and it seems to me the way things are going in Canada today it's rather a matter of parties are considering just the division of the spoils. I think our interest should be to get as good a constitution and as good a way of amending the Act as possible and not just be busily engaged trying to divide the rights that will be that of the province's and that of the Dominion Government. Personally, I also feel that probably the provinces of B.C. and Alberta who have social credit governments should have given more study to this and paid more attention to it.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

I find trouble with the resolve part in that this is supposed to be referred to Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons for further study and possible public hearings. I think this government should take the initiative and do that on their own. Why refer this to the Canadian government and ask for something and probably which might be turned down? Let's do it on our own; take the initiative and have meetings here in Manitoba. I think this should receive much more attention than we're paying to it. We should be dealing with this at least in Committee of the Whole so that we could ask questions and have answers given; not just having one formal debate where you make a contribution and that's the end of it - that's the only chance I'll have to speak on it. So I think this is too important a matter to pass up just like that.

Then too, when I take a look at the various sections and how they in future are going to amend the constitution and how they have been amended in the past, it seems that some of the amendments were purely a matter of the Canadian government, of the Federal government. But then we also had some amendments which affected the provinces, and here I find, in all the cases I think it is, it's either one -- it's a matter of economics or it's a matter of bringing in socialized legislation; and even this socializing legislation boils down to economics. It's purely a matter of economics if you take a close look at it.

I would like to refer to some of the amendments that have been made in the past. For instance, the first one I would like to mention is the matter of the Unemployment Insurance Act, which was -- we had to have an amendment in 1940, and the provinces agreed to it; but I think if we, even at that, if we give consent that at least we should be looking after our own interests and getting the Unemployment Insurance. Look what has happened. We gave our consent but then we find ourselves later on crying for unemployment insurance for our farm workers when we could have insisted on it in the first place and which would be provided if we did give consent, so that we wouldn't have to go begging afterwards. So this is a matter of socializing legislation.

Then I would like to refer to some other ones. We have the latest one, which is the Canada Pension Plan, that's another matter of this type. Then we had the matter of the natural resources turned over to the provinces. This is economic in my opinion. We had subsidies to the provinces. Yes, and the Old Age Pensions - when that bill came in or when the legislation came in we had to have an amendment. It all boils down that the -- it's either a matter of socializing legislation, and following that up it's a matter of economics. So I think we should - if that is the case, then we should take a closer look at the way our economic system works in Canada and do something about that, because like the Old Age Pension, like the Canada Pension, the Unemployment Insurance, this all has to do with providing purchasing power for our people who, because of old age or unemployment, have to have the necessary means for existence to live by, and I'm not opposed to that; but I think it should be looked into and it could be done in some other form than just the way in which it is being brought about, and that it has to come from taxation.

I had an Order for Return made in connection with the powers that were surrendered to parliament during time of war, and to find out what powers have been returned and so on. I would have liked to have had more time to read up on the matter because the Return quotes the sections and the reports which I should read and which would give me the information. I haven't been able to do that, but here in this connection I too find that we have been giving up our rights too rapidly and I think without giving too much thought, and that in this way we have lost certain of our provincial rights.

And here I would like to briefly, first of all, turn to what some of our previous speakers said in connection with the -- on the resolution in this debate. Normally I don't make it a practice to refer to the leaders of the Opposition, because I don't think it's actually too proper; I think our comments should be directed to the government. But I was very interested in what the Leader of the Opposition had to say and also what the Member for Brokenhead had to say when they debated the resolution the other day. I find that the Leader of the Opposition says, and I quote from an article in the Winnipeg papers, and it says: "Mr. Molgat declared that the revised draft of an Act to provide for the amendment in Canada of the Constitution of Canada which was approved last October by Prime Minister Pearson and the premiers of the provinces delegated too many residual powers from the Federal Government to the Provincial Government." I would take exception to that. I don't agree with that in principle.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Then it goes on, or the article goes on further down and I quote again: "Mr. Molgat argued that to have certain residual powers in the hands of the provinces was not in the best interests of Canada. Among these powers were trade and commerce, the militia, issuing the money, weights and measures, immigration, criminal law, interprovincial and international tariffs and individual taxes." Here again I would take certain exception. I wouldn't say that in all cases, but certainly in connection with interprovincial tariffs and I don't think there is such a thing that you could make stick, and certainly as far as individual taxes are concerned I think that field should be left with the provinces and not be handed over to the Federal Government.

Then, I would also briefly like to refer to remarks made by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead in speaking in this debate, and this has to do with the matter of rights, minority rights and provincial rights and so on, and he is quoted here as saying: "In challenging the resolution calling for further federal study of the federal draft, Mr. Schreyer contended that provincial rights are not important enough to entrench in the constitution." Here again I would take exception, because I feel this is an all-important matter and that we should have gone further than what the resolution before us provides, because I think that provincial rights should be entrenched and we are treating them too lightly. And I could give examples of what I'm referring to or what I mean by it. I feel that we're flouting with rights in connection with our marketing legislation. We're taking away the rights of individuals left and right in legislation of that kind. And also in connection with the standing bodies, that they are taking the rights of the property owner. Decisions that should rightfully belong to the property owner are being made by the planners and I certainly do not accept that.

Then the article goes on and says here and I quote: "He said a Bill of Rights should be entrenched into the constitution. This would be far more important. We don't have constitutionally safe-guarded civil rights." And here I agree with him. I think that we should have a Bill of Rights for our citizens, and I have no quarrel with that part.

There was also other things mentioned in their speeches. Some called for the experts to look into this and that we should be guided by experts. I don't believe that is right either. I think we're the representatives of the people in the Legislatures, in the House of Commons, and this decision should be met with the elected representatives.

I think in some of the amendments and the legislation that has happened in the past, that through it we've been selling our birthright for actually a mess of pottage, because these rights, once you lose them they hardly ever are being restored, and I think this will hold true in the time to come as I can see it. Then also, if we had our provincial rights entrenched I think we wouldn't have to fear that we would lose them as fast as we're losing them today, and I for one feel that our provincial rights would be much closer to the people and would therefore be better for the people. Lincoln once said that "the least government the best government" and I think there's a lot to say in this respect.

I think and I feel very strongly that we in this House should not ask the Federal Government to give it further study, or the committee of the Federal Government, but that we should do this ourselves, and I think it would be worthwhile to even have a special session for this to do just that, because this is very important in my opinion and will remain so for time to come, unless the government thinks that it is a hopeless case of getting further amendments or getting the proposition improved on, that is before us.

As far as the delegation of powers are concerned and to which most members speaking have referred to, I don't find too much quarrel with that, excepting in connection with Section 13 of 92 which refers to the property and civil rights, and that here four provinces when agreeing to, can amend. I think this should be further restricted to all provinces, and in that way it would be entrenched and that would suit me much better.

So that Madam Speaker, these are some of the views I hold and I would certainly plead with the government that we give further consideration to this to have this go to committee in some way so that we can discuss it more fully and get some of our questions answered, and I think that this would be to the betterment of the situation.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Hryhorczuk, Paulley and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 6; Nays 39.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, C.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would propose just to say a few words in closing the debate.

Madam Speaker, I'm certain that all of us are grateful for the contributions which have been made to this debate and I'm also certain that many of us, if indeed not all of us, approached the discussion of a topic of this nature with some diffidence because of our, perhaps realization of the technical nature of a resolution or measure such as is before us at the present time, and of the far-reaching implications that anything that we do in this field may have. And it is difficult to project our thoughts far enough ahead or to feel that we may do so and anticipate the result or effect of what may or may not be done.

In addition, we do not act under the compulsion that attends when one realizes, or a group of people realize, that they must do something. In 1864 and the years immediately at that time, those who were convinced that there ought to be a union of the colonies and provinces of British North America to form a confederation, were of course under the strongest possible compulsion to arrive at a basis of agreement and a basis for the statute which was to follow, because if they didn't do so then they were unable to achieve their principal objective. We're not under that same compulsion because we have our country and, with perhaps some difficulty at times, we're carrying on and I suppose that one might say that well, things will carry on reasonably well even though we do not devise a method of bringing to Canada the necessary authority and power to make amendments to our constitution, desirable and all as that might be. So, as I say, it is a difficult problem to perhaps debate and discuss under these special circumstances.

It is also a question on which there are obviously widely divergent views. For example, the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead said provincial rights should not be entrenched, and on the other hand the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, with equal conviction I am certain, says that provincial rights should be entrenched. That just illustrates the difference of viewpoint - viewpoints honestly and sincerely held, and who is to know what is the right or the wrong. One can only hope that what is done is for the best of all of us now and for the best for the future. And in that context I can only say, Madam Speaker, that I believe that what is presented here by way of a draft represents the greatest consensus of opinion on this matter that has been reached, not just simply from two or three meetings in October, 1964, but as the result of a long series of meetings and consultations and consideration which began in 1927, and that one can see that whereas in the beginning there was very little area of common agreement, there has been a growing area of agreement even though still many differences, until we have arrived at the point where, as I say, I believe we now have the largest degree of consensus that has been secured in this important matter, but still recognizing differences of opinion and indeed not really being able to say whether what is suggested will work as we would hope that it will.

And so it is from that point of view that I have presented the resolution and recognizing, as supported by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that there is need for a further examination of this matter and that is what is called for by the terms of the resolution itself. On that particular point I would say to the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, who suggested that there ought to be public hearings here in Manitoba, I'm not certain that that would serve a useful purpose. We did have, prior to dealing with this matter in our 1964 session we had opportunities for public hearings in Manitoba and I must say, with some regret, that they did not attract much attention and did not -- there were not many people who came to say anything about it. Whether perhaps now as we have come closer to something firm and specific in this field whether there would be more interest or not it is difficult to say. Certainly on the basis of our previous experience, one would say that nothing too useful would be accomplished by further public hearings in Manitoba.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd).....

Just speaking of the address of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I want to say that I support his view when he said that we - he's then speaking I presume for his group in this Legislature - believe in a strong central government and that also while believing in provincial rights, again repeating that he believed in strong central government, and I think that's most important; and I believe, Madam Speaker, that in the proposal that is in the Bill that's attached or forms part of this resolution, that we have provision for a strong central government bearing in mind the necessity of arriving at some agreement but again recognizing that this aspect of it needs the most careful, or, as he has put it, "a grand inquest in open forum," so that is what the resolution in effect calls for - a final examination on the highest, in the highest political sphere of our nation before being finally decided upon.

And so, Madam Speaker, it is on that basis that I ask the support of the Members of the House for the resolution which is now before them.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: On division?

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, we'd best have a recorded vote.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

A standing vote was taken with the following result.

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hryhoreczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Paulley and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 41, Nays 3.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare that . . .

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): May I interrupt the Minister before he can make the motion. We have two bills that haven't been proceeded with and I was wondering when we could go ahead with those, 112 and 130.

MR. ROBLIN: Not this morning, Madam Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Welfare -- Resolution No. 101.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to unduly impede the work of the Committee but I do feel that there are a few remarks that I should make on the introduction of these estimates. First, I would like to pay tribute to the staff of the Department of Welfare that I consider to be second to none in the provincial service. I think that perhaps more than any other department of government these people have had to contend with a changing role and with changing programs more than anyone else.

To begin with, in 1959 we brought in the new Social Allowances Act which was supported by all members of this House and which changed the entire procedures under which welfare is administered at the provincial level, requiring personalized assessment and service to individuals and families in need. Secondly, we have the introduction of the Community Development Program, the beginning of Care Services, Elderly Persons Housing on a new and enlarged scale. We have the Multi-Service project, the first attack on slum conditions in Canada, our Fitness and Amateur Sport program, and to some extent we have been pioneers in all of these fields in Canada.

The challenge of these programs has been met by the department to a very high degree and within the limits of their financial and physical resources. I would like to personally

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) thank them for their loyalty, for their dedication, and for the considerable progress that has been made in meeting the needs of Manitobans. I would also like to express the gratitude of our department for the excellent co-operation and help that we've had from the many private voluntary religious agencies, service clubs, municipal corporations, even members of this Legislature, in helping us to do the work of our department. It's indeed much appreciated and we look forward to continued co-operation of all of these groups in the future.

Last year, at the time of the introduction of our estimates, we had a brief look at the history of Welfare and how it has developed from the parish level or the municipal level to the present situation where the senior governments are carrying very heavy responsibilities with respect to welfare problems. In addition to this we had a look at some of the changing programs and changing conditions that welfare departments have had to meet, and I would like to say a word about this very shortly.

But first I would like to have a look at the cross section of welfare expenditures which are involved in the estimates before the committee. To begin with, the program for the elderly of Manitoba involving Old Age Assistance, Supplementary Assistance, Medicare, Elderly Persons Housing, represents over a third of the expenditures that are before us - 33.5 percent to be precise. The program commonly known as Mother's Allowance, that is, assistance to families who have been deprived of their breadwinner, and the Child Welfare Program, involve expenditures amounting to another 32.6 percent, so together these two programs involve almost two-thirds of the expenditures from the Department of Welfare. The balance is made up of assistance to the blind, the disabled, the unemployable, 13.4 percent. Our share of municipal relief costs, which is largely paid out to the able-bodied unemployed, and for unorganized territory relief is 18.3 percent. The rest is made up of our assistance through community programs, Fitness and Amateur Sport, Community Development, our Multi-Service Project, Grants to Charitable Institutions.

In order that we may put this in some kind of perspective with respect to other provinces, I would like to say that Manitoba ranks fifth of the ten provinces in welfare expenditures. We pay less than the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, Quebec and Newfoundland, but we pay more, and only slightly more, than the Province of Saskatchewan, but we pay more than Ontario and the Maritime provinces. At the same time we believe that we're giving service at a very high level, among the highest in Canada, and a scale of grants that is adequate to meet the needs of those who are our responsibilities.

Today, I believe that we have a better public understanding of welfare problems than perhaps ever before. Part of this, I suppose, springs from the taxpayer's personal interest in the large expenditures that are being made by various levels of government, but I think more because of the rather massive programs that are being contemplated, one of which is underway in the United States, this war on poverty, which has focused a great deal of attention on some of the very urgent social problems in that country. I suppose in Canada we might say that we have reached the cold war stage in considering social problems in this country, and there are some isolated skirmishes across our nation sponsored mainly by provinces. We believe that we have some very constructive programs with respect to poverty in Manitoba.

I believe, too, that the news media of various kinds have been responsible for telling a great deal, a great many of the facts about welfare problems. There have been some excellent books written on the subject. Two that have come to my attention and that I would commend to the House are *The Other America* and *In the Midst of Plenty*, which is a pretty graphic story of people and their circumstances which have forced them into their present state of poverty. There have been three magazine articles that have come to my attention within the last couple of months - the *Maclean's* issue of February 20th, in which they discuss "Our Invisible Poor" in Canada; the *Chatelaine* article, the current issue, in which is discussed Canada's most urgent social problems; the *US News and World Report* of March 8th in which they discuss the mystery of rising relief costs in the United States. All of these articles point out that welfare isn't what it used to be. Last year we had a look at some of these differences and discussed very briefly the extended family -- the disappearance of what is known as the extended family. We mention briefly the very large change in population characteristics which have resulted in a population explosion at the senior citizen level; and I would like to mention here that we presented a brief to the Senate Committee on aging, which outlines our departmental views and the government's views with respect to our aged population, and if any members of the committee would like to receive copies of this, I would be very happy to supply them.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....

Today I would like to look very briefly at the other end of this age spectrum, and we find here that things have changed very substantially as well. I'm thinking of the young people that come into child-caring agencies or become wards of the various levels of government. At one time the people who came into child-caring agencies were orphaned or young people who could not be supported by their families because of some financial or physical catastrophe, and this situation has pretty largely disappeared today because of the advances of medical science which have ruled out most of the killing diseases, and we have developed Workmen's Compensation and other welfare or social measures to look after people who ran into financial difficulties.

Today our problems with people who come to child-caring agencies centre largely around the disturbed child, the product of neglect or of family breakdown. Miss Touzel in her article in *Chatelaine* describes these children as coming from homes that have been socially or psychologically wrecked. These children require special care, they require special treatment, in some cases they require psychiatric help, but in every case they require the knowledge that someone cares for them, is interested and concerned about them and about their future. Miss Touzel in her article also describes how the pressures of poverty have contributed to family breakdown. She describes the man who might, given a reasonable chance, have been a good citizen and a responsible parent, has become the deserting father. The deserted wife who fights an ever-losing battle with rent, bad health, under-nourishment, overwork, becomes the carping mother, the alcoholic or the mental patient, and the children, listless from malnutrition, missing classes to mind younger children while mother is ill or at work, improperly clothed, bored with the general dullness of their life, become the school dropouts, delinquents, and all set to repeat the vicious circle. And I think here's where the real tragedy is; and society is the loser in human terms and in terms of dollars and cents.

Those of you who had the opportunity of seeing the article on *Our Invisible Poor* in *Macleans* will recall the very bleak and stark pictures of poverty. The story tells of the economic circumstances which led to the kind of poverty shown in the Province of New Brunswick which I think is not unlike many other areas of Canada. These circumstances gradually impoverished otherwise people who were once independent farmers or fishermen or forestry workers. It caused discouragement, destroyed their initiative, and eventually their loss of self respect and their judgment. These people had the misfortune to be born on small farms, in poor districts, in areas with inadequate educational facilities and with poor teachers. Others in our society are born in obsolete cultures, or in blighted areas where industry has evacuated or where mines have closed or where automation has taken over. Others may be sick or disabled or too old -- and I mention here that "too old" today means anyone over 40 years of age. But generally we, as members of society, don't see poverty. We don't see the poor because we're not looking or we're looking the other way, or they're tucked away down the side roads; and I'm speaking generally of the population - I'm not talking about the member of the New Democratic Party or other interested members in this House who I am sure have run into this condition. But the general public doesn't see the poor, and the general public doesn't visit the slums and the people who live on the fringes of "respectable" society. These people are lost in the national averages which continue to show satisfactory progress, and as standards of living rise so the disparity widens between the affluent and the poor.

The description of people living in poverty is quite different from the normal stereotype conception that most of us have of Canadian citizens, because we think of ourselves as being the red-blooded, self-reliant, rugged, hardy individualists. The stereotype of poverty has no regard for racial background, whether it be Anglo-Saxon or French or Icelandic or Negro or the North American Indian.

In the U. S. *News and World Report* article it's indicated the population increase in that country for the past ten years as being 18 percent, and at the same time it showed that the people receiving relief had increased by 42 percent - and I would like to digress here just for a moment to say that the elderly today in that country, and in the last ten years, have not only shown a relative decline with respect to numbers on the welfare rolls but a national decline because of their social security measures in that country, so that really this growth in welfare statistics doesn't contemplate the elderly to the same extent that it does in the Province of Manitoba; and at the same time the relief costs in that country have risen some 90 percent in the last ten years, and over the last 18 their relief costs have gone from 1.2 billion to 5.1 billion - here again, not taking into account social security payments, aid to veterans, unemployment payments, which all amounted to some 25 billion dollars.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....

The Commissioner of Welfare for the State of New York says the reason for the increase in relief rolls is the increase in family break-ups, in desertions and in separations, and he went on to say this, and I think it's significant: "And it's also the failure of all of us to shift our sights to a whole new set of social and economic factors in the 50's and the 60's and likely to be even more present in the 70's."

Raymond Hilliard, the Director of Public Aid for Cook County, which includes the City of Chicago, says: "As men lost their jobs they began deserting their wives and children. The problem was compounded when deserted women began having illegitimate children." He went on to describe the typical ADC mother - these are people who are receiving assistance under the Aid to Dependent Children program - and he describes her in these terms: the girl left behind; she is insecure, uneducated, frightened; she lives in a hovel; she has no social or recreational outlet; and she craves security. In this same article they quote many other people who say similar things and confirm the same facts, at least the same opinions as are expressed by these people. The article goes on to give some ideas of some of the officials and politicians in that country as to how the welfare situation can be controlled, or to some extent overcome, and they mention that there should be tougher handling of the able-bodied idlers - and I digress here again to say that I don't think you can get much tougher than some of the municipal officials in Manitoba who have the bulk of the responsibility with respect to the able-bodied unemployed. They also say that there should be more emphasis on training facilities to teach the unskilled. There should be greater incentive to seek employment for those on welfare. There should be a crack-down on illegitimacy and a dissemination of birth control information. There should be better-trained social workers, and the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for the United States, Mr. Ribicoff, said that only four percent of the people in welfare work in the United States are properly trained. Presumably he means social work graduates from one of the recognized universities. Another suggestion that they had was more foster home care and institutional care for children in slum homes and with delinquent potential. We would say there is potential child neglect children.

I just mention these things because I sometimes think that it's wise to look at people whose experience in fields is somewhat greater than our own, and I say that the United States is much farther advanced industrially and in urban developments than we are here in Canada, and they have probably greater experience with the kind of problems which have resulted from these conditions.

Now I come back to Manitoba to look at some of the things that we're doing here in our province, and I'm only going to touch on a few of them. First of all, we're meeting need with respect to those who are our responsibility. We can't solve the economic, social or cultural problems when people, individuals or families are hungry, cold, sick, or are faced with problems that are too big for them to handle. In the field of education, we know some of the efforts with respect to educational upgrading for skilled development, vocational training possibilities, and all of these things. Industry and Commerce, we know something of their efforts to try to stimulate growth and development within the province, and I'm sure that we will shortly hear of the program of the Minister of Agriculture, the program that he is co-ordinating under ARDA to try to look at some of the specific areas of underdevelopment and the specific areas in which poverty exists.

In our own department, in Community Development, we're trying to build self respect and confidence and independence and leadership among people who had at one time all of these qualities. Their reliance upon the dwindling resources - and I'm saying dwindling only in terms of the large increase in their numbers - remote living, the reserve system, all of these things have tended to isolate them from the rest of society and the changes which are taking place. They're confronted today with a multiple handicap - language, custom, culture. They're ill-equipped educationally or by experience to be self sufficient in today's economy and under today's circumstances.

The security which the reserve system has given to them must today be replaced with a better education, marketable skills, relocation opportunities, placement programs, and a confidence that other Canadians are willing to help them to attain a more abundant life.

We believe too that we should encourage the pursuit of healthy recreational outlets for all Manitobans. We're trying to do this under our Fitness and Amateur Sport Branch by assisting municipal organizations and municipalities in creating recreation programs for all of our citizens. We're helping with program expansion, leadership training, leadership seminars and

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....conferences, training clinics. We're providing films, pamphlets and training aids of various kinds. And this year we're into a new program of assisting communities to get recreational leaders. This is a pilot project of helping a number of Manitoba communities to establish summer recreation programs. It will be done on a cost-share basis with the municipality providing living costs and transportation, and the province providing an honorarium and assisting with consultative services from our own department and from those organizations which receive grants for leadership training activities. There will be ten university students from the Faculty of Physical Education, which will be placed during the month of July and August in several Manitoba communities. This project we feel will test the need for and the effectiveness of organized summer recreation programs under trained leaders. Some of them may not be limited to communities but may serve an area or a district.

For some time now our department has been very conscious of the shortage of trained staff. We think we're considerably better off than they are in the United States where only four percent of their staff is properly trained, or properly qualified, but this is no reason for complacency, and although we've had a staff-training program for some time, we feel that there is not the number of trained personnel that we need to look after the problems that we're being confronted with. We think there's little or no likelihood of being able to obtain under the normal means the trained staff that we require. I heard not so long ago that the United States require over 100,000 trained social workers and they're turning them out at something like about seven or eight thousand a year in that country, so the needs have no chance of catching up to the demand in that country and I think the same situation pretty well exists here.

For this reason, we've been discussing with the Department of Education the possibility of a technical course for high school graduates for those who want career opportunities in the field of welfare. A course will be offered in Brandon this year for 30 high school graduates and we hope that they and successors in this training program will be a substantial help to the province and to the other agencies operating in the province to perform a better job for our people. We're presently reorganizing our staff and the responsibilities of staff members to accommodate the graduates from this course.

We think one of the important functions of trained staff is to be able to recognize problems or symptoms of problems early, in order to prevent serious economic and social consequences. The failure of social agencies of health departments, of law enforcement agencies, probation service, of children's aid societies and all of the other agencies to recognize and deal with total family problems, is demonstrated in our Salter-Jarvis area. We're already getting from this co-ordinated service research which we think will be very helpful in preventing similar recurrences and in helping us to rehabilitate those who are already the victims of slum environment and their social condition.

I'd just like to mention one family that's come to my attention recently, a family in the Salter-Jarvis area who have had in the last sixteen years the equivalent of 83 years of service from various agencies and departments of government. Their assistance has totalled some \$32,000. They've produced five children who are almost guaranteed a repeat performance except for the intervention of a program which can help them to meet their problem. They've had over 40 charges in courts, one of the boys is on probation, two are in detention at the present time at the Home for Boys in Portage. A girl nineteen years old is an unmarried mother; and so far the only one with a clean record is the five-year old and Heaven knows how long he will keep out of trouble except for the kind of prevention and rehabilitative service that we're able to provide. We're working with this family and I'm advised that already there has been substantial progress made.

A year ago we announced the Government's participation in the Social Service Audit. At that time I may have referred to it as the Needs and Resources Study, but this is a program which involves the Greater Winnipeg community representing some 70 agencies, the Community Chest - now the United Way - the Community Welfare Planning Council, Winnipeg Foundation, and the Province of Manitoba. We're looking for answers to the following questions: the nature and extent of the present social problems; what we are doing to meet these problems and what we can or should be doing; and how well the various agencies are co-ordinating their efforts to make sure that the best possible results can be achieved. To help in this survey, which to a large extent is going to be a self-survey, we're involving the agencies and some hundred if not thousands of workers and members of these agencies in the study.

The policy committee under chairmanship of Don Thompson has considered it wise to engage the services of a team of professional consultants, the Lorne Hyde and Associates, and a

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . . . budget is presently being established by the sponsoring agencies which are the Foundation, The United Way, and the Province, to determine the sharing of the costs for the study which will soon be underway. We believe that this study will be helpful in contributing to a better understanding of the nature of our changing social structure and how we may best assist in adjusting to it. We believe that the government must assist its citizens as individuals and in community effort in repairing such weaknesses as may exist to the end that all citizens may enjoy their share of community rewards and responsibilities.

As I mentioned earlier, this is not a comprehensive inventory of our departmental activities but it does show some of the constructive measures which are being taken to strengthen our social progress and to help our citizens to adjust to social changes. Other details of our departmental activities will be revealed as the estimates proceed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare for the brevity of his report, and I hope that I can follow along in the same vein. And I must not let this opportunity go by without thanking his staff for the excellent co-operation and assistance that I received from them throughout the year. I have said on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, that this is the department that I communicate with more than any other branch of the government I believe, and I have found them very co-operative. I believe that about 48 percent of all the civil servants of the province work for either the Department of Health or the Department of Welfare, a combination of the two, according to the report that we have before us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the disturbing things about welfare, of course, is that in this affluent society of ours that it should reach such proportions. There just doesn't seem to be any relationship, as the Honourable Minister has said, between the prosperity of a nation and the prosperity of a province and the amount of welfare that is doled out. I note that the municipalities, the cities and the councils of all the various towns in the province are very concerned yet over their high cost of welfare. I have before me, as you might expect, Mr. Chairman, a clipping or two - this one is from the Free Press, December 24th - just pointing up that the Social Aid Act is four years old but still not fully implemented, and the municipalities, as I have already indicated, are very concerned over the fact that their welfare costs have not gone down, have not diminished, in spite of what the government is doing in this field.

I'm going to read part of it here to just point up what I'm saying: "The Act" - and he's talking about the Social Allowances Act - "was hailed as a masterpiece of social advancement when it was first proclaimed by the Government in 1960. Under the provision no Manitoba citizen was ever going to sink to the position where he would have to scrape for the basic necessities of life. Four years later, - well it's five years later now Mr. Chairman - "the government is finding it difficult to reconcile practical economic realities with the noble concept enunciated in the Act, and as a result Manitoba municipalities are still bearing the full brunt of welfare costs for at least four types of citizens who were originally slated to become a provincial responsibility. This has happened because the Cabinet has never brought into force the entire Social Allowances Act which it proclaimed five years ago." And so, Mr. Chairman, it is very disturbing to learn that despite everything that the Minister has done or professes to have done that it has not taken away but has left, according to this article, the full brunt of welfare in four fields with them.

Now Mr. Chairman, one subject that I talk about annually when we reach these departments is the overcrowding of our hospitals; that is, the bed shortage, and means to alleviate this problem. As I have already indicated on more than one occasion, the first resolution that I introduced in this House was a very brief one that had to do with this subject matter, and I proposed that at that time - and that's six or seven years ago - that nursing homes, more nursing homes would alleviate this problem. I have had doctors, several of them, tell me in the past, Mr. Chairman, that one of the ways that they could alleviate the bed shortage would be to prescribe - I suppose you could put it this way; make more Medicare cards available for our older folks.

Now it is an acknowledged fact, whether we like it or not, that many people enter hospital because of certain high expensive drugs that they require, and the way to get those drugs is to put them in the hospital and have the drugs administered to them there. The doctors have told me they could administer the drugs at home; they could write out a prescription and say, "Take this down to the drug store and get \$30 or \$40 worth of drugs," and thereby it would not be necessary for them to go to the hospital, but they haven't got the money so they go into the hospital, spend three or four days there, occupy a \$25 a day bed, and it all adds up to three or

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... four times what it would have been had they been able to give them the drugs at home. This has been confirmed by one or two matrons, hospital matrons that I know of. They point up that 50 percent of the hospital beds are occupied by long-stay patients who could be as well cared for in other alternative care institutions.

According to the annual report - not an up-to-date one, Mr. Chairman, but the annual report of the Associated Hospitals of Manitoba of three years ago - and if it isn't up-to-date I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister how the situation has changed today. Has it improved from that as reported in the '62 annual report, when it says that 25.6 percent of the treatment days in the general hospitals are occupied by patients who stayed there 30 days or more - 25.6 percent. And they go on to say that we all know that the main bottle necks arise from the long-stay patients. Well we have the doctors telling us that, we have the associated hospitals concurring in that, certain matrons telling us that, and my honourable friend up to now hasn't touched on alternative care institutions. How are we progressing in this regard to alleviate the hospital bed shortage and to reduce the overall cost? Because after all is said and done, Mr. Chairman, I have always maintained that in everything but politics I am a conservative. I am a conservative in my own spending habits and I am a conservative when I am spending the other fellow's money. And so, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should be doing more to provide these alternative care institutions.

I would like my honourable friend to tell me how we are progressing in the town of Neepawa in this particular regard, because about five or six years ago a certain individual there left his entire estate for the express purpose of building an alternative care institution. He didn't call it that; he named it in the will as a nursing home. We now like to call them alternative care institutions, to provide for infirm people. And under the legislation of that day it was impossible to get government assistance on nursing homes because the Willard Commission was still making their report and the government told us for three or four years on end there that they were going to wait until the report had been tabled and then they would make certain recommendations in this regard. So Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what are the new plans in regard to government assistance for alternative care institutions; that is, a combination of elderly persons' housing and nursing homes, the various types that the communities councils, social organizations can build, can qualify for grants.

Mr. Chairman, back about three weeks ago I asked a question before the Orders of the Day relative to the proposed closing of the Assiniboine Nursing Home in Brandon. I was told by the Minister of Health that yes, they were going to close it, and I think they were proposing to build a similar home adjacent to the Brandon General Hospital I believe; and then I asked him what would become of the 170 aged patients that were presently receiving accommodation in the Assiniboine Hospital, and I suppose that the intention is to put all or part of them in the new alternative care institution that they're building adjacent to the Brandon General Hospital. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more about this aspect of the program. Is this what the government intends to do from now on and forever more, to close existing nursing homes whether they be private or be government, close these and build new ones adjacent to the general hospitals in the areas? I would like to know, too, whether or not the new proposed alternative care institution at Brandon -- will the doors be open to everyone in the Province of Manitoba requiring treatment, similar in nature to the one at the Assiniboine Nursing Home now, because I know it's a fact that five or six or more patients from the Neepawa area are presently in the Assiniboine Nursing Home, and it's a blessing for our community that there is such an institution to put them in.

My honourable friend talked about the "Invisible Poor," that article in Macleans Magazine that touched on this very touching subject, and I must say that I have read it and I immediately thought of Steinbeck's books, Tobacco Road and the Grapes of Wrath, and I think that perhaps that inasmuch as my honourable friend has pointed out that there is a real drastic shortage of welfare workers, that this is one of the problems in his department, one of the real problems, I'm wondering if it is not possible to train people for this work at MIT. It seems to me that in the whole field of rehabilitation and in social work that what is really needed is a commonsense approach, and as Bobby Bend might say, real horse sense.

Now I know when the social workers go out - and I request them to go out on many occasions to see people in the Gladstone constituency - they don't really have to have a Grade 12 education and three or four years' social studies to deal with people of the nature that are really in dire straits. I wouldn't mind doing the work myself. I would go out and sit down at a kitchen table with people, go over their problems, talk them over, find out what their needs are. In

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). many cases, if you could supply them with a Medicare card - no social allowance dollars - give them a Medicare card, give them more peace of mind. There's all kinds of people in this province and in every other province who are getting along fairly nicely on their pension, particularly if there are two of them in the household getting \$75.00 each, that's \$150 coming in, but their big fear is, well what am I going to do if I get sick? What's going to happen to me tomorrow? And even if they have two or three or \$4,000. in the bank they can envisage that it would be out the window overnight if they had to spend a month or so in the hospital. So if we could offer them some assurance, some peace of mind, we would have a happier society.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned Robert - Bobby Bend, I keep calling him - but I think that here is a man that does have a great deal of what I call "horse sense", common sense and understanding, and he is speaking all over this province at annual Chamber of Commerce meetings and other meetings along this field of rehabilitation, if you like, getting people to work in spite of their lack of degrees. As a matter of fact - I've said this before and I don't mind saying it again -- he cites several examples, cites the barber for instance. Why is it necessary for a barber to have a Grade 12 education? If he can cut hair and if he can change a dollar bill, put him to work. This applies I think in a lot of other fields, where we could rehabilitate people, rehabilitate people. The Society for Crippled Children and Adults are doing wonderful work, wonderful work in this field. My honourable friend knows that there are many people who are not physically totally disabled, and they're not totally mentally disabled either, but they're in a gray area there to the extent that they are completely unemployable. Nobody will employ them. And probably in this area we could do a lot more than we are doing to rehabilitate them, get them back into society.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this field of nursing homes, in the entire field of alternative care institutions -- I think that's the proper word to use because when you start talking about nursing homes then you get into the ambulant care and semi-ambulant care and so on and so forth. But what I fear as we proceed to build more and more alternative care institutions, is that the cost of care in those institutions will probably get out of hand. I believe that right at the moment this is one concern of the committee at Neepawa. They say that on completion of the new proposed alternative care home there that the cost, the per diem cost, will probably get up to six or seven or eight dollars a day, and this is probably understandable in this day and age. I'm wondering if it is not time to have another look at the possibility of encouraging private alternative care institutions, because as we proceed, as we proceed to have governments do everything for us, the costs seem to get completely out of hand. I know that there are lots of people, all kinds of people who would say to me or to members opposite: "You give me \$100 a day to operate a private alternative care institution and I'll look after 12 or 15 patients for you. Gladly." And I think if we want to - if we're interested in keeping the price down, if anybody in the world is interested in keeping the price down, maintaining the price, it's individuals, private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that I would like to know about these alternative care institutions too, and long stay patients. I think it's generally acknowledged that your Manitoba Hospital Plan will pay for your cost of care so long as you are in a hospital, so long as you're sick. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be assured that that is absolutely correct. My honourable friend the Minister of Education says as long as you're sick they'll pay for it. Well I know of cases where they wouldn't, because I understand that the doctor is the adjuster in this particular field and if he thinks that you have reached the point that you can be cared for equally as well at home or in some other institution, then they're not long in advising you that you're no longer welcome at the hospital. I had a chap here whose wife has been for two or three years in the Assiniboine Nursing Home in Brandon, and he was concerned for fear that the government would seize his land or place a caveat against his land or so on, for the cost of his wife's care there.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, will my honourable friend allow me to interrupt him so that the committee can rise and go into Law Amendments. I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the committee to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by

(MR. COWAN cont'd).....the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, 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, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.