

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 4th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your standing committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their ninth report. Your Committee met on Monday, May 3rd, 1965, and Tuesday, May 4th, 1965. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 116, an Act respecting the Law of Partnership; No. 120, an Act to amend The Shops Regulation Act; No. 122, an Act to amend The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act; No. 123, an Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act; No. 127, an Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 119, an Act to amend The Mortgage Act; No. 121, an Act respecting the Temporality of The Anglican Church of Canada; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee recommends that the fees paid with respect to Bill No. 121, an Act respecting the Temporality of The Anglican Church of Canada, be refunded, less the costs of printing.

Your Committee also recommends that the terms of proposed Section 24, as set out in Bill No. 119, an Act to amend The Mortgage Act, be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and report. All which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, by leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the fees paid with respect to Bill No. 121, an Act respecting the Temporality of The Anglican Church of Canada, be refunded less the costs of printing.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, by leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, the following motion: "Whereas on the first day of April, 1965, Bill 119, an Act to amend The Mortgage Act was introduced in the House; and Whereas the said Bill 119 proposed that a new Section 24 be added to The Mortgage Act as follows:" -- and then there follows in the resolution the copy, proposed of Section 24 as it appeared in Section 2 of that Bill 119 -- "and Whereas the proposed Section 24 of The Mortgage Act was not reported by the Standing Committee on Law Amendments; and Whereas the Standing Committee on Law Amendments in its report received by the House on Tuesday, the 6th day of April, recommended that the said proposed Section 24 of The Mortgage Act as set out in Bill 119, an Act to Amend The Mortgage Act as it was introduced in the House, be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and report;" -- and obviously there's an error here, Madam Speaker, that should be the 4th day of May rather than the 6th day of April -- "Therefore be it resolved that the proposed new Section 24 of The Mortgage Act as set out in Bill 119, an Act to Amend the Mortgage Act as it was introduced into the House, be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for consideration and report."

Perhaps, Madam Speaker, you might wish to dispense with reading the resolution.

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

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, the Honourable Member for St. George made an inquiry yesterday concerning a contract for helicopters for fire-fighting services of the province. I can report to him that public tenders were called for this service. A number of tenders were received and the lowest tenderer for amount was awarded the contract. We have since been advised by the lowest tenderer that he is unable to carry out the contract and in these circumstances consideration is now being given to the contract being awarded to the second lowest tender.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. This morning he called private Bill 104 and disposed of it for second reading. I would like to ask him at this time why he didn't call two other private bills, 112 and 130.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, these are public bills and they'll be dealt with in due course.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Before the Orders of the Day, I beg leave of the House to read a short statement. I think there is quite a bit of interest in this.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. DESJARDINS: A course for beginners in Conversational French will be offered at St. Boniface College this summer. The method used will be that sponsored by the French Ministry of Education called "Voix et Images de France". It is a six-week course in July and August and the teacher, Madame Ragot, has had plenty of experience in the method. For information phone the Registrar at St. Boniface College, if they wish, it's Chapel 7-4819. I read this because I know that there's quite a few people that are interested. There is no experience needed on this at all, no base for those that have't had any French at all.

Now, Madam Speaker, while I'm on my feet I wonder if I'd be permitted also. There's someone here that is celebrating a birthday and I think that we might call these people, the department that we have, the unsung heroes of this House because they're working quite hard, and Mr. Jack Reeves, the Assistant of the Clerk of the House is a young 47 today. I think we can recognize his superior also

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources which I would like him to take as notice. It has been told to me that a major point of contention between the property owners in the Birds Hill Park area and the department - one of the major points of contention is as to whether or not the property lying east of the new Highway 59, as to whether or not that property has, or was intended to have access to this new PTH 59, and I would ask the Minister to check to see if this is in fact so, that this is a major point of contention.

MR. LYON: I'll be glad to take that as notice, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address another question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He said the lowest tenderer had advised the department they could not accept the contract. Could he tell me where that contractor is located. Was that a Quebec contractor or not?

MR. LYON: I'm really not sure where the location is of the contractor.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the Honourable Minister has had a delegation or a petition presented him from the home owners in the -- I think they call it the Grand Beach Touring Park. I know that I asked this question previously and I wonder if he's heard from these people since then.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the Minister can inform us if there is anything can be done for these people or are they satisfied.

MR. SMELLIE: The matter is under consideration, Madam Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. In view of the information that he gave the House that the Grand Rapids station could not supply power to the southern system, could he indicate whether the province is presently buying power from Saskatchewan?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I haven't got the answer to that now but I'll take it as notice and advise the member tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Madam Speaker. Could he also find out whether we are buying power from Ontario and the amounts that we are buying from both.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 132. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for the statement he made this morning and for supplying copies of the correspondence. This is much faster being done this way than through Hansard so it gives us an opportunity to see exactly what the propositions

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . were. I'm somewhat disappointed that we do not have copies of the correspondence from the City of Winnipeg, and I appreciate the answers the Minister gave us that this was not within his responsibility. It would however help if the City of Winnipeg were prepared to do as the CPR and let us know exactly what their views are. I presume that they will be in a position to do so once we reach second reading of the bill.

The Minister can assume from my statement that I don't intend to oppose second reading although I don't suppose that my opposition to it would stop it from going through in any case. I will support second reading of the bill in order to get it into the committee and see exactly what the statements there are from the two parties who are immediately concerned.

There is a third party however very vitally concerned in this, and in the long run I think the party that probably has to be most concerned of all, and that is the over-all population of the Province of Manitoba. Last year when this was first brought into the House we had a brief discussion on it. I pointed out in my remarks that there were other long-term agreements which I considered to be of vital concern to the Province of Manitoba, and I refer for example to the Crows Nest Pass rates, I refer to the Branch Line Abandonment and these other matters in which we are involved inevitably with the railway companies.

I don't think that I would be prepared to support second reading of this bill if there was any indication whatever that our actions on this bill would prejudice our position in the broader field of Crows Nest Pass rates and Branch Line Abandonments, because I think that in the final analysis, with all due respect to the position of the City of Winnipeg, that the over-all concern and the over-all problems insofar as Manitoba are concerned must be considered, and that this agreement if it were to affect our position, our negotiating position with the Canadian Pacific Railway, then should not be proceeded with.

I presume from the statement made that these other factors are not in the least in consideration in this matter. Certainly the correspondence gives no indication whatever of any erosion of our over-all position, but I would want to have before final reading of this bill a very definite assurance from the Minister that there are no implied or other considerations whatever insofar as the other matters in which we may be involved in the long run so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are concerned.

Certainly the existence of agreements that are in perpetuity are a vexatious problem. The proposition which appears to have the acceptance of the two immediate parties concerned is, if they are both agreeable to it, I presume a reasonable one. I'm pleased to see that the government has been able to arrive at this point with apparently no great conflict. It would seem from the letter of the CPR that they rather readily accept the proposition one as laid down. I would again, as I said earlier, like to know exactly what the position of the City of Winnipeg is.

So, Madam Speaker, I am prepared to accept this bill at this stage and vote to send it to Committee, but I repeat, I would want the assurance of the government that our position on the over-all basis on these other matters in which we will inevitably be involved with the railway company is not in the least impaired by the decision this House will make on this particular bill.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two in connection with this bill. I too am not going to object to the bill going to second reading, but I would like to suggest that in the bill that we have before us dealing with the taxation of the Canadian Pacific and the City of Winnipeg dealing with the original by-law which was passed by the City of Winnipeg, that there is no basic principle involved. It appears to me that if there is a basic principle, that principle namely being that the present government feels that the arrangement entered into back in the 1880's was wrong or that it is time for a change, then that principle should be adhered to by this government.

It seems to me as I read the bill that once again it is a compromise of principle being entered into by the government, or a compromise on a lack of principle being entered into by the government, and the longer that I sit in this House, Madam Speaker, the more I'm convinced that insofar as principle is concerned, the present administration are prepared to compromise on principle or to vary a basic principle as suits their particular purpose.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that while I will vote to the passage of this bill to second reading, I want to say to the House that I reserve judgment as to the actual contents and await the submission of the City of Winnipeg respecting this matter, because as I read the bill it seems to me that typical of the government there is more procrastination, more delay.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) until after the expiration of a full 40 years the objective of the principle is achieved.

So I say to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I appreciate as indeed did the Leader of the Opposition in receiving some documents this morning whereby the CPR railroad indicated their acceptance of suggestion No. 1 or proposal No. 1, but I await with great interest the position of the City of Winnipeg respecting this bill. Again I want to reaffirm what I believe, that if a principle is wrong, one should reject it; if a principle is right, then one should support it; and I await with interest the deliberations in the committee regarding this matter.

Also at this particular time, Madam Speaker. I wish to express my objections to the government of Manitoba in presenting this Legislature in what sometimes we presume to be its dying days with the -- (Interjection) -- no, I'm not betting on it at all, Madam Speaker, and may I say in answer to the First Minister, due to the actions of the government that we may be in the dying days, but I do wish to raise my protest as a member of this Assembly at receiving such important bills as this bill in what at one time we thought might be -- it may be changed by approach -- the dying days of this Session, and I think the government should be severely criticized and condemned for this type of action at this time.

We have been meeting here, Madam Speaker, for over 50 days -- or about 50 days -- and only now we have an opportunity of considering this bill. I want to suggest that if members of this House are desirous of giving full scrutiny to this bill on a time basis, one of the first objectors will be the Honourable the First Minister of Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes you will.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the last speaker would permit a question? Is he suggesting that the days of compromise are over, or should we look at things more universally compatible with the day in which we live.

MR. PAULLEY: My answer to my honourable friend, Madam Speaker, is that I have been taught throughout my whole life that there is no compromise on a matter of principle, and if this is acceptable to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River let him have it. But as far as the sons of my father and my mother is concerned, there is no compromise on principle.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhinecland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 110. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 110, an Act respecting payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly and Minister of the Crown upon their ceasing to be Members or Ministers of the Crown, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the principle in this bill is very clear and I think it is well understood by all members of the House as it affects all of them. Now that the bill is before the House, I think most have had an opportunity to scrutinize it and to determine that the simple principle of the bill is to permit the payment of pensions to Members and Ministers, the Speaker and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think the explanation given last evening in committee was in detail and I really have nothing more to add to it than that.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister and I trust he won't be closing the debate when he answers. Could he indicate to the House -- he said last night as I recall his statement that this was not based on an actuarial basis, that there was no actuarial arrangement here. Could he indicate to the House, either by a table or by some figures that he could supply us, the approximate amount of pension that would be received by members who have been here for the period of time, the minimum period of time that is presently set up in the bill, and how it would affect -- in other words, examples of how it would affect a Member, a Cabinet Minister, so that we can have an idea of exactly what it means in dollars and cents; and then if he has any idea at all of what this will mean in the terms of total cost insofar as the Treasury.

MR. STEINKOPF: Well, Madam Speaker, all of it will be on a hypothetical basis because one cannot tell how many members will avail themselves of the pension and at what times they will do it, but taking a fairly representative group being members of the pension.

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) both the Members of the House and Ministers, the amount of cost to the Treasury would be in the neighbourhood of \$20,000 per year. Now again this is just a very rough estimate.

A member who had eight years of service or eight sessions, his average indemnity would be \$2,550 -- or his indemnity would be \$2,550. Just let me correct that. If the average indemnity over the last eight years was \$2,550 - it's changed from the \$3,200 that it is now - his retirement allowance would work out to \$612.00 per year. His contribution for the eight years would be \$1,224. It works out very simply that you get back your contribution in two years.

For the Ministers, the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition, let me give you an example. For a Minister who has served eight years, the average salary over the last eight years is approximately \$11,000. The retirement allowance would work out to \$2,640 per year, and the payments will be just twice that or \$5,280 per year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I beg to 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: The Honourable Member from Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, at 11:30 this morning I was commenting on the Minister's contribution to the estimates that are before us, and I am not going to be very much longer for two or three reasons. I have a terrible cold and that presents a problem for me.

Now I believe that the last comment that I made in regard to services that were made available to the people by reason of the fact that they paid their Manitoba Hospital premiums was contradicted by the Minister of Education, and he said something to the effect that your care would be assumed so long as you were sick and regardless of where you were indefinitely, and I say that that is not quite true.

I have before me a very short letter here that is worth reading. It concerns a dear old couple about 80 years of age each, and she spent a week or ten days in the Neepawa Hospital this winter - in fact in February, I believe - and then was asked to pay the hospital bill herself on the grounds that she could have taken the necessary care and treatment as an out-patient. A copy of the letter that was addressed to the hospital in Neepawa by the Manitoba Hospital Commission was also sent to the husband - and he immediately brought it in to me because he couldn't read English and said, "What does this mean? What does this mean?" - asking him to pay the hospital bill. So I immediately got in touch with the doctor and he said, "Oh well, there's something wrong there." How could you expect a lady of 80 years of age to drive in at least 30 miles into Neepawa in February this year daily for out-patient care treatment. It was absolutely ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, incidentally, eventually they paid it.

Well there is apparently a new development taking place in the field of welfare, and I suppose without saying anything I could refer my honourable friend the Minister to a couple of letters that I wrote him in the last ten days I believe. I'm still waiting for a reply. Of course I probably won't get a reply, but I just brought to his attention a couple of matters that I think need further consideration.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, has the member ever written a letter to me where he hasn't had a reply? He's certainly suggesting that in his comments at the moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, if the letter that I wrote to him - I think I wrote both of them on April 20th, it's not too long ago and I will probably get a reply - but I said, Mr.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) Chairman, that probably I wouldn't get a reply because I had just brought to his attention a couple of matters. I don't care whether I get a reply. I thought perhaps he might send a copy of a letter that he had written to his office in Portage to me, but I haven't got it yet.

But it concerns this, and perhaps I could read the letter without mentioning any names in particular because it points up two or three cases that are identical to it, and I've addressed it to my honourable friend the Minister as I've already said on April 20th this year. "Dear Mr. Minister: One of the councillors in the R. M. of Westbourne has recently got in touch with the relative to the proposed suspension of social allowance for the above-captioned party. I understand that your department is considering suspension of her social allowance on the grounds that she presently is the owner of certain farm lands." This land in my opinion is very sub-marginal and the income from it was very limited indeed.

"Since social allowances are paid on a basis of need, it is difficult to understand why your department would want Mrs. So and So to dispose of her land. Surely if the revenue from the land helps to reduce the amount of social allowance that she needs, it would only be common sense to allow her to maintain any meagre income that it produces and thus reduce the amount of social allowance that she requires."

Now this points up the case, and I know of two or three cases - in fact I have another letter right here along this same theme - and in the case of this one lady, I think she has seven or eight children, she's a widow, but if she has some small income property, property that is bringing her in a small income, why not let her hold it. It reduces the amount of social allowance that she needs. So I would like my honourable friend to tell the committee what the program is in this regard. Can you or can you not have property; and to what extent can you hold property and still draw social allowance?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said some months ago when we debated at some length the new utility taxes and the effect that it would have - the effect that all of those utility taxes would have on social welfare cases - I understood him to say at that time that when we reached his estimates he would proceed to tell the House of the new schedule of fees that are going to be applied on all social allowance cases. Mr. Chairman, he nods his head in the negative. He doesn't intend to tell us that. Well he said words to that effect, because he certainly acknowledged the fact that it would have an effect on a person's needs.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what is the smallest social allowance cheque that is issued by his department now. -- (Interjection) -- The smallest and the largest. Yes, the smallest and the largest. I have a letter before me here where it says you will be receiving a \$2.00 cheque --- (Interjection) -- Seventy-nine cents, my honourable friend says. Well, maybe there are cheques going out for 79 cents, because I know about the way that they determine whether you qualify for social allowance. A social worker goes out and they consider all of your income and then the social worker sits down and estimates in accordance with a schedule that he has what your out-go will be, and then it's just a simple matter of arithmetic. You take one away from the other, and as my honourable friend from Brokenhead says, if you're 79 cents short they send you a cheque for 79 cents and so now you're fine and dandy - that fixes you up. That's the way they do, but I didn't think there were any 79 cent cheques went out. Apparently they do go out for \$2.00 because I have a letter - maybe they do go out for 79 cents.

Then too I would like to know in the thousands and thousands of cases where there are people in various alternative care institutions and the manager of that institution is withholding their old age assistance cheque or old age security cheque, what portion of the cheque is left with the patient for out-of-pocket expenses, or whatever you want to call it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that -- Oh, we were talking about the welfare of the members and the possibility of introducing - well I guess there's no possibility of introducing, it's already been introduced - a pension for the members. I have been repeatedly asked, I think every week-end that I have gone home since the session started, by civil servants of the province, what happens to their pension plan upon implementation of the federal pension plan? That is, the Civil Service Pension Plan presently in existence, what happens to it upon implementation? If my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary prefers to answer that, it's fine and dandy with me, so long as I get the answer to satisfy the people who are asking me.

Mr. Chairman, this morning I expressed some concern over the fact that if all of the alternative care institutions were going to be maintained by the government, there was a danger - there was a danger that the cost of care would get out of hand so to speak, and I thought

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) perhaps that this House should consider very seriously the advisability of granting licences to certain individuals to construct and maintain nursing homes and alternative care institutions.

I have now before me an Order for a Return No. 17 on the motion of myself, tabled on March 19 last, in which it sets out the per diem rate in all of the licensed nursing homes in the province, and elderly persons homes, and it is interesting to note that they vary from \$2.20 a day to \$7.00 a day. I guess \$7.00 a day is the highest, but it does point up what I have said before, that there is a great variance in the per diem cost in some of these institutions. It's too bad if a number of them are operating very successfully, and by that I mean very successfully for the owner and operating successfully to the point that my honourable friend is satisfied with their operations, then perhaps we should investigate further the advisability of granting licences to private individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to set down for a while until my honourable friend answers some of these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, there are a few matters in this group of estimates which interest me, but I must confess to the Honourable Minister that one of the matters that I would like to clear out of my mind first of all is to make sure that I don't overlook the opportunity of enquiring from him about whether he has seen any part of my -- not my, but of the people, the taxpayers \$5 million which I claim is buried somewhere in these estimates. I gave previous Ministers an opportunity to reveal any portion of it and now I want to make sure that the Minister of Welfare has an opportunity.

Since he is looking at me in a questioning vein I'd better make sure he knows which \$5 million, although I doubt if the government has really hidden more than one \$5 million item. I draw to his attention that according to the calculations which I gave in detail a number of weeks ago, the government is raising some \$24 million in special taxes imposed last August, and as far as I could calculate I could only find some \$19 million which is being returned to the real property taxpayer in extra payments by the government in these estimates. Therefore, according to my simple arithmetic there's a \$5 million difference which I suspect has been blended in to the general revenue of this province and is being used for provincial purposes; and if that is the case, I'm suggesting there is something immoral about raising money one way with an undertaking to disburse it in a certain way and then not disbursing it in the way in which it was planned to be done.

Now I took the precaution of pointing out that I'm no expert, but I'm still searching for it and I haven't received any help from the other side to indicate where to find it, so I am using this means of asking this Minister of Welfare whether in these estimates which we are now considering there is any sum of money which is earmarked as the kind of money which was discussed last August by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, and I'm sure he'll deal with this in due course.

Now there are a couple of other matters I'd like to deal with, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I'd like the Minister to clarify for us the basis of the formula which is used in the giving of a Medicare card, and I'm dealing now with the person who does not pay rent but rather lives in the home with a daughter let us say or a son and who may or may not qualify for Medicare. I presume there is a formula and I presume it's understandable because the Minister's department deals with it and applies it, and before I go into the question I'm looking forward to hearing from him as to what the formula is.

Next, Mr. Chairman, is the formula which the government feels it uses in payment of welfare benefits. Now the government does pay welfare allowances, and what is more, a much bigger part of the budget is the contribution to municipal welfare payments which is made on the basis as set out on Page 12 of this year's annual report of the department which reads as follows: "Claims from municipalities are paid on a formula which guarantees a minimum of 40 percent of cost, but which may also be calculated at 80 percent of the amount by which relief costs exceed a sum equivalent to a levy of one mill on each dollar of the equalized assessment for that year." Now through that basis there are very substantial sums of money being paid by the government to municipalities as a contribution to the welfare costs of the municipalities, and in the estimates for the year there is the sum of \$2,375,000 set aside I think for this purpose.

I'd like to know what this government does or what the department does in making sure that there's the same standard of welfare for the people who are the beneficiaries of these --

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) or the recipients rather of these welfare payments. Two years ago I asked the Minister what the formula was. He was pretty new to the department then and he was not able to answer the question, and this morning I was reading Hansard of last year just to see what had happened about this problem last year and I discovered that I mentioned this problem and described the problem to the Honourable Minister; asked him to clarify it; and I concluded my statement by saying on Page 1789, "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." I am assuming from that that two years ago he said he was going to make such a canvass and the answer that the Honourable the Minister made last year was, "Well I regret to disappoint my honourable friend because I really don't have any report to make on that subject at this time."

Now that was on April 10, 1964, so that it is almost 13 months since he couldn't help us out, and now I must inform the Honourable Minister that I have some information which may help him in some way, and that is I have before me a chart showing a rough comparison of welfare benefits being paid in Metropolitan Winnipeg. This is not exactly a comparable schedule because different municipalities pay with slightly different stresses. Some do include clothing, some do not; some are averages set out for different months; but in the main they are here.

It's a lengthy schedule so I don't propose to read it, but I'll take the family of four and indicate the wide discrepancy paid in Greater Winnipeg to a family of four. By the Province of Manitoba, \$183.00; by the City of Winnipeg, \$138.68; by East Kildonan, the same as by the province; by St. Vital, \$113.06 plus clothing amount which could be about \$18.00 I figure in this case; by the City of Transcona, \$118.00; North Kildonan I am informed has no rate at all, no rate schedule; Fort Garry, \$131.50 plus clothing; St. James, \$187.40, although it is indicated that this may be a little high because the month when this was averaged may have been a higher cost month; West Kildonan, \$152.50. So that leaving out St. James, I find a low of \$118.00 paid in Transcona and a high of \$183.00 paid by the Province of Manitoba.

At the time this schedule was prepared, the Department of Health of Winnipeg had made a survey and recommended an increase to the City of Winnipeg, and some increase was approved of, so that the City of Winnipeg amount is now greater than the \$138.00 that I mentioned. But the Department of Health in Winnipeg considers that a proper payment should be \$156.00, so even there we have a wide discrepancy between the Department of Health estimates and the province's contribution, and most of this money, Mr. Chairman, comes from the same source, and that is provincial revenues, because the province does contribute on the basis of 80 percent over one mill.

Now to me this is complete and utter nonsense, Mr. Chairman. I do not conceive that it costs a person more to live in East Kildonan than it costs to live in St. James. I do not consider that it costs more to live in one part of the municipality -- Greater Winnipeg rather -- in Metropolitan Winnipeg than it costs in some other place in Greater Winnipeg, and to have this disparity means either that somebody is getting more than he needs or somebody else is getting less, and to think that there's no formula, which this government at least suggests, would indicate that there's no leadership, and that is the one challenge that I'm making to the Minister, the fact that there's no leadership from his department in indicating what is a fair and proper welfare allowance which should be paid in this province and particularly in this case to Greater Winnipeg.

I suggest it's time that this province accepted the principle laid down in the Michener report, and may I say laid down by the New Democratic Party at the last election, that services to people shall be paid out of revenues contributed by people. It's time that this province undertook the responsibility of providing the monies which are needed to look after all welfare recipients. So I'm looking for this government to give us some sort of indication of the objective it's trying to reach. If it is to assure a minimum acceptable standard of living, then surely there must be a basic minimum basic standard which is established for all; if it is to provide purchasing power for people to stimulate economy, then it should be the same type of purchasing power; and certainly direction is something which I think the government must participate in and must accept and assume.

Now in connection with this contribution of 80 percent of the amount in excess of one mill, on Page 12, the sentence following what I have already quoted from the current report -- and incidentally may I just digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, and tell the Minister that I've been studying the front cover of the report for quite some time and I must say that Mr. Wuttunee, if that's the proper pronunciation of the name of the artist, has me somewhat

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) buffaloes because I'm really having difficulty understanding the diagram, but it is interesting.

Coming back to Page 12 -- well there is a mending process involved in the needle and thread but this bone that seems to be used is -- (Interjection) -- the bone of contention is suggested. Anyway coming back to this sentence, it says, "During the year the department pays the monthly claims on a 40 percent basis making the final adjustment when indicated after the full year's claims have been received."

I was amazed, Mr. Chairman, to learn that the City of Winnipeg budgeted a contribution from the Province of Manitoba of \$1,956,000 in 1964 and the actual amounted to \$1,954,816, which is as close as one can get to hitting it right on the head. This province, on the basis apparently of the formula which is set out in the sentence which I just read from the report, deals with the payment of the estimated 40 percent and then at the end of the year pays the difference.

On December 31st, 1964, I understand that the province was indebted to the City of Winnipeg in the sum of \$1,346,668, and I'd like to understand the justification for charging to the City of Winnipeg taxpayer the interest cost on over a million dollars which the government knew and the City knew would be payable by the province to the City. Why should the City of Winnipeg have to wait for its money -- and I'm speaking now in an amount in excess of a million dollars -- to wait for its money and pay interest on the money during the time when the province should be contributing an amount which both the province and the city knew would be paid.

Now surely they didn't know the exact amount, but when the City could estimate it as closely as I have indicated, the province could surely pay some substantial portion of this so as to reduce the load on the City of Winnipeg ratepayer to pay interest on monies which the Province of Manitoba undertook to pay. I don't understand the sense to this and I would like to know whether there's any explanation which the Honourable Minister can offer to us to indicate the reason for this delayed payment and the subsequent interest cost imposed on the City of Winnipeg ratepayer.

These are matters which occur to me would be of interest to the Committee to hear the Minister comment on, and after we hear it I hope we can then discuss the formulae which he supposedly has in relation to the questions which I have raised.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise one matter pertaining to the Department of Welfare and that is in connection with the department's delay in handling applications for adoption of children. I have brought this matter before to the attention of the Honourable Minister on previous occasions, I think once last year as well as two years ago, and it seems the situation hasn't improved any to this date.

I know the Honourable Minister has mentioned that they haven't got the social workers, but I think that he has had enough time to correct the situation if this is the case. I would say it's sheer hypocrisy, because on one hand we are crying and pleading with the people to accept and open their doors to take adoptable children; and on the other hand, we have to delay people for almost a year and a half in reviewing their applications.

For instance, somebody came to see me just very recently that had been to the Department of Welfare and was told that we will not even bother looking at your application for nine months, and after we do this it'll take another three to four months before we can interview you and check over your application. So it seems that it'll take almost fifteen months before any application is considered. I think it's much too long and this situation has existed in the department for quite some time. I know this only applies to Assiniboia, St. Charles and St. Boniface, but this has been a concern in my constituency for the last couple of years because I've had many people bring this to my attention.

Now I have an article from the Winnipeg Free Press of Friday, April 30th, just last week, and I would just like to quote part of it, not all, because it's quite a lengthy quotation. "Aid Society Seeks Homes for its 105 Children. The Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, with the largest backlog in its history of children up for adoption, is pleading for applications for adoption from Greater Winnipeg parents. The number of children less than five years old reached 105 this week. About half of the 105 are under a year old. The total at the same time last year was running from 70 to 80.

"To help clear the backlog the CAS will employ seven extra workers for July and August. 'We're squeezing the community for applications', said Robert J. Marcus, Director of CAS services. 'We're sure there are people who want to adopt and take in an extra child.' The

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . CAS will accept immediately applications from parents in all areas of the Metropolitan area except St. Boniface, Assiniboia and Charleswood. The Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba with headquarters in St. Boniface has jurisdiction over St. Boniface, and the Provincial Welfare Department handles adoption applications from Assiniboia and Charleswood.

"Mr. Marcus said, 'Parents, if approved after a CAS study of the home situation, could expect to receive their adopted child in several months and at the latest by September 1st.' He and Ethel Wheeler, CAS Supervisor of adoption and foster care, reviewed the situation in a joint interview. We're not looking for childless couples, but also for families with children, families which can provide for and love another child." And it goes on to explain all the way down the line.

Now my concern is the Children's Aid Society is crying for homes to open the doors and adopt these children and on the other hand the Department of Welfare is telling us we're not going to even look or bother looking at any applications for nine months and then it will take another three to four months for interviewing purposes and to check into the application. I know this has existed for a couple of years and surely the Honourable Minister can do something.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): to speak in connection with the same matter raised by my colleague from Assiniboia, and my remarks are particularly directed towards private adoptions. I think that in respect of private adoptions that priority should be given in the matter of their processing. The reason why I suggest that is this: in a private adoption the mother usually places the child with the people who intend to adopt that child. Now they then file notice with the department or with the Children's Aid Society in Winnipeg of the fact that that child has been placed with them for adoption. In most cases that child is very very young, maybe a week or two weeks old. That child has just come out of the hospital.

Now I had cases where it has taken the better part of a year to do the initial work in connection with the processing of that application. Then the matter has to come to court. You get your interim order of adoption and that interim order of adoption may not become absolute for a period of one year.

Now if that child is placed in the intended adopting parents possession or control when it's of tender years, the only people that that child knows are those parents or those intended adopting parents, and I think for that reason, so that no psychological or other harm will be done to that child in the event of the court finally deciding that those adopting parents are not proper parents for that child, I think that every effort should be made to speed up and give top priority to those private adoptions.

It's a different thing where people go to the Children's Aid Society or to the Director of Welfare and state that they wish to adopt a child and that child is not placed in their home. There's no affection created between the child whom they haven't seen and the parents, but in those private adoptions there is a great deal of personal relationship established between that child, and nobody can tell me that a child, no matter how young it is, doesn't acquire love and affection for people that are good to it and the only people that that child knows are the people who intend to adopt it. So I therefore urge the Minister to use his offices for the purpose of trying to streamline the procedure in the matter of private adoptions.

There's another matter too. They usually - those private adoptions or any adoptions they want references. Sometimes they want as many as seven references. Now surely there must be some way of getting those people together at one time, say at a hearing where they could give character evidence, rather than have a social worker go round and see each one individually and maybe take months to gather up that evidence. Surely there could be some way of having these people appear in court; give evidence under oath if need be, or give evidence to the judge even not under oath; but let's do something to speed this thing up.

MR. SCHREYER: I have a few general and miscellaneous comments to make on the estimates of this department. I would begin by saying that I've had reason in the past to read through the welfare legislation such as we have and to go through the regulations under the Act. I've tried to understand the legislation of the regulations and I hope that I do. I have no basic complaints about the regulations that have been issued in recent months, or a year or two ago, however, occasionally there do come up individual cases which the regulations do not seem to cover or anticipate too well, and then one has cause for questioning the gaps as between one regulation and another.

For example, I was always under the impression that out in the country especially if

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) someone wanted to apply for old age assistance at 65, that he or she could own property up to a certain amount without impairing his or her eligibility, and that one could own a car as long as it wasn't too snazzy a car, too new and too expensive, that this did in no way impair one's eligibility. But in recent weeks I've had occasion to find out that in one case, and I don't think that the individual case here is too important it's the principle behind the regulation, namely, that a person cannot qualify for old age assistance until he sells his car and uses up the proceeds therefrom, and I think this is kind of silly in the country. A car is ten or twelve years old, it's the only means of transportation that one has to go to town for groceries during the week and so on, and I don't think that this regulation or policy can be supported. I would ask the Minister if this is a recurrent question or problem that comes to him.

With regard to Mother's Allowance and the Mother's Allowance program, it is my understanding that in the city for example, a widow with children may own a house, and if the house is paid for the widow - the mother - may qualify for Mother's Allowance and there is no question, there is no attempt made by the department to place a lien on that property. The only occasion I understand when the department will place a lien is when the widow has to make monthly payments on the house. If it's an expensive house and the payments are high, the department will make the payments and place a lien on the difference between the average they're prepared to pay and the higher amount that they're actually paying, and I think this is a good policy. After all, one who is on welfare should not expect the society to make payments on a very expensive house.

However, whereas in the city no lien will be placed on the house and property if it's paid for when the widowed mother is receiving allowance, in the country it's not that simple. A widowed mother out in the country with two or three children - or however many - it has happened on several occasions that a lien is placed on the home quarter, and the home quarter in the country is a basic sort of property. It's as basic as the house and lot in the city, and if you don't place a lien in the case of the city property, why place a lien in the case of the house and 160 acres for example in the country? That sort of bothered me. I'm not sure if this is even in the regulations. It seems to me a practice that has grown up in the department, a practice which dates back only to February of last year, '64, and I think some justification is necessary of this, some defence of it by the Minister.

A third point which I'm sure the Minister has had brought to his attention is the question of continuing municipal responsibility for welfare. Members here know the Province of Manitoba pays 80 percent of all welfare costs to a municipality over one mill. However, the municipality has to make up the basic mill cost and then 20 percent of anything over that. In the first place, it can be argued that the province should assume all of the costs of this welfare - and I'm coming to that opinion myself - but in the meantime, let us assume that the government is not prepared to go out to that extent.

In the meantime, it seems to me that this government should clarify one aspect of the existing policy and that is for how many years should a municipality continue to be held responsible for this basic one mill cost and 20 percent of anything over one mill. I think that there should be a time limit, three or four years, beyond which if a person continues to be on welfare - living in a municipality or even moving out of that municipality, it doesn't matter - the original municipality is still held responsible for the portion of the cost. Well, all right. Three years perhaps it can be justified - four years - but I say that there comes a time when this practice is hard to justify.

I know of cases where people on welfare originally living in a rural municipality have now moved into the City of Winnipeg. They continue to receive welfare and the rural municipality where these people lived years ago are still responsible for a portion of the welfare costs. The process can be reversed. The City of Winnipeg is held responsible for welfare costs for people who have originally received welfare from the city and then moved out to some hamlet or village out in the country. And it does aggravate some municipal officials, I think with some justification. Years go by and the municipality continues to be held financially responsible for this. I think that after three or four years the province should be required to assume the cost, the total cost of the welfare.

And on this question of time limitation on municipal financial responsibility, the year or four years I've used - the figure four years - in the report of the department I see that reference is made on, I think it's Page 1, to the fact that the province has this Mother's Allowance program to pay for the upkeep of widows, mothers and so on; and also there's a program of

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd.) assistance to the physically or mentally disabled and this is the Disability Allowance.

Then Item (3) -- this is on Page 9. I'm sorry, on Page 9. Item (3) of The Social Allowances Act provides for assistance to families where the breadwinner has deserted for four or more years. I think one can rightfully question this figure four years. When the breadwinner dies, the widowed mother is immediately eligible under The Mother's Allowance Act, and it seems to me that when a breadwinner has deserted, to the mother the effect is the same. There is no income coming in and the effect is the same then as though the breadwinner had died. How can one justify a time lag off our years before The Social Allowances Act becomes operative?

Now I know that there can be a good retort for that, that if you didn't have some minimum time period for qualification that there would be what, too great a temptation for breadwinners in financial difficulties to tend to leave the scene and thereby leave the burden on provincial coffers. That is the only argument that I can foresee as being one which would even begin to justify this time lag of four years.

Mr. Chairman, another point has to do with ward care. I have mentioned in this House already on one previous occasion that it was very shocking to me and to other members I am sure when they discovered that at the Vaughan Street Detention Centre there were young sub-teen non-offenders being held there. When I was first told of this back in the early spring a year ago, I was almost incredulous, and then I discovered after some checking that the reason for this is that there is such a complete scarcity of adequate receiving-home facilities in the city in the metropolitan area, so that young children who have been taken from their delinquent parents -- perhaps that's the right term -- or have been taken from their homes for whatever reason, if foster home facilities cannot be found for them then they are sort of kept in receiving-homes -- in receiving-homes -- of which we only have to my understanding two or three with very limited accommodation, so the result is that not infrequently young sub-teen non-offenders are being kept in Vaughan Street. I think that the Minister should tell us what the province intends to do about receiving-home facilities. This obviously will entail an expenditure of monies but it's not the most expensive thing in the world to do, to provide for more receiving-home facilities, and it's very much needed according to my understanding.

I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, of the relationship of the Department of Welfare to the volunteer agencies that exist in the city working with the young homeless. We have for example the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and the Children's Aid Society of St. Boniface. Now then, the Provincial Department of Welfare provides in the estimates for over \$2 million to be paid out for foster home allowance, but is there any provincial responsibility beyond that, Mr. Chairman? The reason I am asking is because I have a rather bizarre incident to relate to the Minister, one which he'll probably want to take some further interest in.

The Children's Aid Society, when it places a child in a foster home, pays an allowance to the foster home parents. The responsibility for that child however is not clear. Out in my home area, a couple of years ago a foster child was playing with two neighbourhood children behind a haystack. They were taking a smoke and they burned the haystack down and the barn and caused considerable property damage. The barn was partly insured -- or lowly insured -- and some compensation or damages were received by the owner. By the way the owner was not the parents, or the foster parents of any of these three children, it was a neighbour's. But for the hay, and there was a substantial amount of hay involved, there was no insurance obviously and it was a complete loss.

Now then, the owner -- and before I go any further I would like the honourable members to bear in mind that you don't stack tons of hay easily. It's hard work in the heat of summer, and then to see it go up in a puff of smoke can be very disheartening, not to mention the money loss involved. Well in any case the owner tried to recover some money for the loss of the hay from the Children's Aid Society. It was not forthcoming. They were not legally responsible for this foster child's action. The neighbour, the neighbour whose two children were also involved would not pay anything either unless the foster child, someone had paid on his behalf. I don't think it was particularly selfish. I think it was a case of one insisting that he was to pay in proportion.

Finally the neighbours, the neighbours in the community got together and they raised a pot of money -- or a purse of money I guess you'd say -- and they were on the verge of distributing it -- or rather passing it on to the farmer, the man who had suffered the loss, the hay, etc., whereupon the foster parents, the foster parents of the one foster child insisted that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) there was no need to do this, that the Children's Aid Society would assume the financial responsibility in proportion, that is to say one third. So the three or four people who had acted as leaders in the raising of the money in the neighbourhood promptly turned round and gave the money back to the people, and later on it was found that the Children's Aid Society was in fact not legally responsible and did not consider itself ethically or morally responsible and would pay nothing. Then of course the natural parents of the other two children refused to pay also, and the end result was that the man who had suffered this loss received nothing.

Now out of this story comes only one point, and that is that where there are foster children placed, I think that the foster parents should be appraised more fully, told more clearly just what the legal responsibilities or what their duties are with respect to that foster child and so on and so forth. It was obvious in this case that the foster parents were under the misapprehension that the Children's Aid Society would assume full financial and other responsibility for the actions of this foster child and it is obviously not so. Some clarification should be considered in this connection.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, before I take my place, I would like to ask the Minister if I am wrong when I say that I have the impression that this department of this government is not doing really very much -- it is doing considerable in some areas but in the area of regional alternative care facilities it is not really doing very much at all. That's my impression. I get the same information sheets that the Member for Gladstone gets, the pink ones, and I read in them from time to time fairly frequently that one town and the next town is building an elderly persons housing unit and that the provincial grant is pretty substantial. This is impressive, that's elderly persons housing; but what about the regional type -- and I presume it has to be regional -- alternative care facilities, nursing home care facilities. I don't see much happening in that field, neither in the Metropolitan area nor in rural Manitoba and it seems to me that this is an area that should receive priority because my experience is that it is very difficult, very difficult indeed to obtain placement of an elderly person who needs nursing home type accommodation. For years now there has been talk, in Beausejour for example that the hospital, the 16 bed hospital which leaves a great deal to be desired in terms of facility, that it was going to be converted into a nursing home care type unit and that a new hospital would be built. Well there has been talk of that kind now for five or six years and that's what it's stayed at -- talk. It seems to me, I can't speak for the rest of the province but in Eastern Manitoba, not just Brokenhead but Lac du Bonnet, Springfield and so on, in this whole area which is normally called North Eastern Manitoba, that there should be some nursing home care facilities provided; because if they're not provided the tendency is for these people to be placed in hospital care, they take up hospital beds when they don't really need hospital type care and this is more costly. So it would actually be a case of economizing it seems to me while at the same time providing a necessary facility. So why isn't the department doing something more in this particular field of responsibility. I am very interested in this last point in particular and would like the Minister to elaborate more on it.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I have one point that I would like to bring up while we are on general matters and that is this part of the Act that is not proclaimed and that prevents social workers from giving deserted mothers the same treatment as ordinary cases. As members of the Committee know, in municipalities where there is no welfare department as such whenever needy cases arise they usually approach the municipal council and ask for help, sometimes due to different causes but usually they ask for help which is needed immediately and the council will give them a kind of help "on a for the time being" basis and the case is then referred to the Welfare Department who usually if the case proves that it is to be a continual one will take over. However, when comes the case of a deserted mother, because of the part of the Act that is not proclaimed the social worker cannot deal with this case or give her help from the Department of Welfare. Now I know that the department will reimburse the municipality to the extent of 40 percent if they don't reach the one mill and 80 percent if they do. but it seems to me that the attitude of the municipalities in these cases is that, well if the Welfare Department thinks they should get more why don't they give it to them.

I agree with what the Minister said a while ago when he said that most municipal people were tough with welfare cases, especially when it concerns able-bodied people. I don't mind at all if they are a little tough. But when it comes to cases such as these the fact that they don't have the means to study the cases they are of the opinion that these cases are handled by

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) the provincial welfare I don't think they receive the necessary attention. I think this is a very important matter. About three cases I think have been brought up to my attention during the last year and the Minister knows one special case I brought to his attention and I must say that I received the best possible co-operation from the department and as a matter of fact I think that this particular case has been dealt with now, but I think that this is a lot of trouble to go through if we are to give the necessary assistance to people who are in trouble over let's say sickness or special conditions, certainly the fact that a lady is left with some children and in most cases when she is left she is left with no money and not too much furniture and so on.

I know of one case for example where the lady was left and all she got from the municipality was \$55.00 a month, with five children, and they paid her heat bill which was - she was heating the place with wood and the rent which was I think \$10.00 a month. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me - desertion, right - and the department cannot look after it because she hasn't been deserted for four years. Now it's been I think 2-1/2 years, I investigated this case myself. I even went as far as going to the local store and checked her store bill to see whether she was living in my estimation the right type of a life and that she didn't spend money foolishly and the local storekeeper had advanced her to the tune of \$200.00 over and above her allowance because he just could not see this lady getting along on that small an amount. So I certainly ask the Minister to give this type of legislation special consideration. I certainly think it's important because of the fact that as I said the municipality is under the impression, well, if they look after the others and they're not going to tell us what to do in these cases.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, while the honourable member referred to this matter of desertion and that they had to be deserted for four years before they can receive assistance, I have a similar case that was referred to me and it just so happened that this chap deserted his wife but he would return probably every other year once, and probably just for a casual visit, and just because of this, this lady was barred from getting assistance. It's the wife's parents that are looking after her. This is a family of four or five children, and this really is a hardship. And what could she do? She couldn't help if he just drops in - probably once every two years - and yet this very fact barred her from getting assistance. I think this deserves attention.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Minister has had quite a considerable number of questions directed toward him already and also I can appreciate that many of the questions are repetitious, but I think that it is necessary for us on this side of the House, who by and large only have the opportunity when we meet, to draw to the attention of the Minister many failings of the government. That even though the approach may be repetitious it is necessary for us to constantly emphasize the shortcomings of the administration and to try and persuade or cajole or to impress upon the respective Ministers the necessity of action in many fields.

Before I really go into repetition once again I want to say to the Minister that I appreciate the services that are being rendered by his staff. Any time that I have drawn to the attention of members of the Civil Service problems that I may have respecting the Department of Welfare I have always received from the members of the staff the utmost courtesy and consideration, and I appreciate this very much. I mean, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister himself, he's not too bad an egg, as far as eggs go, and I mean this in a very paternal and friendly sort of a way. There are times when my honourable friend does forget to reply to letters or maybe in some way, in some occasions they happen to be mislaid and it's sometimes three or four months - on one occasion almost five months before I got a reply from my honourable friend - but I forgive him for this because I appreciate that he must be a very busy man. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that he's a very busy man is because of the fact that the government, at least up till now, has not done those things which they promised that they would do in the period of their ascendancy here in the Province of Manitoba.

Maybe, Mr. Chairman, now that they're on the decline they will do what they wouldn't do as their prestige was rising.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, the journals of the first session of 1959. I don't recall, Mr. Chairman, whether you were a member of the House at that particular time, I'm sure that if you were you will recall with me that that was a period of time when we still had here in Manitoba a minority government. And it was quite necessary I suppose in the field of politics for a minority government indeed such as we have at Ottawa at the present time to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....propose for consideration many items of legislation which might be attractive to the members of the Legislature and also the public at large. And during that particular session, the first session in the year 1959, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor proposed to the Legislature in the Speech from the Throne a number of proposals for the consideration of the Legislature. Among others was some proposals dealing with the question of social allowances. And for the edification of my honourable friends here in the House I would like to read one of the portions of the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor at that particular time, bearing in mind of course that it was a minority government. And His Honour had this to say " A Social Allowances Act will secure higher levels of social security for the aged and infirm. The recipients of an extended mother's allowances and others in need -- I think, Mr. Chairman, just as an interjection, this was the first time that I can recall that this word "heed" came into the deliberations. To go on to His Honour's speech of that day -- "this policy will be extended to the Indian people of Manitoba and to immigrants. The financial responsibility in these cases will be transferred entirely from municipalities to the Provincial Government. Neglected children will be also included in this arrangement. My government believes that these changes will simplify administration and relieve local municipal taxpayers of hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense which they bear under the present system." That was on the 12th of March in the year 1959.

Then, following through the suggested proposals that His Honour had read to the Assembly at that particular time, a bill was proposed for the consideration of the Legislature, a bill titled "Social Security for Residents of Manitoba", Bill No. 49, introduced by the Honourable Mr. Johnson who at that time was the Minister of Welfare and Health. The resolution was agreed to in Committee of the Whole; it was given first reading. But after this Mr. Chairman, something happened, for I believe that it was on the 29th of March or thereabouts that the - 31st of March - that the First Minister at 11:35 o'clock in the evening decided that we should no longer, or he should no longer head the minority government here in the Province of Manitoba. But having placed the proposals before this House the First Minister and the Tory administration in this province decided that at that time they had sufficient propaganda to present to the people of Manitoba. As the result of the subsequent election the Tories became the Government of Manitoba. In 1959 second session, the social securities act was proposed to the Legislature and was adopted, containing many clauses which were aimed at the well-being of the citizens of our province. But there was even a catch in this, in that certain aspects of that legislation only came into effect on proclamation. So, Mr. Chairman, the Social Allowances Act now into it's fifth year and there are still a number of clauses that have not been enacted.

I want to quote from a press statement of, Christmas Eve of all times, of 1964, the Winnipeg Free Press, which states as follows: "After being in force for almost four years - actually it should have been five - The Social Allowances Act will not provide for full assistance that was supposed to be offered to many needy citizens. The Act was hailed as a masterpiece of social advancement when it was first proclaimed by the Provincial Government. Under its provisions no Manitoba citizen was ever going to sink to the position where he'd have to scrape for the basic necessities of life. However, the government is finding it difficult to reconcile practical economic realities with the noble concepts enunciated in the Act. 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 provincial responsibilities. This has happened because the Cabinet has never brought into force the entire Social Allowances Act passed by the Legislature. Inoperative on the statute books is a complete section which calls upon the government to provide supplementary assistance to unmarried mothers with two children, to wives deserted for a year, to Indians and to wives of men jailed for a year or more. The government's failure to implement the full Act was protested this week by the Manitoba Urban Association, the group which speaks for this province's urban municipalities. Premier Duff Roblin" - so the news article says "has promised to review the situation but both lack of funds and a dearth of trained workers may forestall any immediate action." Immediate action, Mr. Chairman, do I suggest after about four or five years?

The report goes on, "this double barrelled shortage is also the reason why the government is unlikely to accept the Michener Commission's recommendations that the province accept total responsibility for all welfare cases. Welfare Minister J. B. Carroll said in an interview that the full implementation of the Social Allowances Act can't take place overnight." Of course not. My honourable friend the Minister is quoted as having said it's a massive job,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....but we will ultimately assume responsibility for all long-term welfare cases, Mr. Carroll said. "At the moment the wife has to be deserted for four years to qualify for assistance but this will eventually be reduced to one year and we're working toward that objective," the Minister is quoted as having said.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, how actively are you working toward reducing this period to one year? Are you going to announce to us today while we consider your estimates that as a first step that you are going to cut down the period of desertion in order to obtain provincial social allowances halfway, from four to two? I didn't hear you when you were introducing your estimates. But if you are and if before this committee completes your estimates, then I'll be satisfied that you are working toward the objective that was set out in the Act of 1959.

The news report goes on - "despite the Act's limitation it is still putting more than \$10 million a year into the pockets of about 23,000 Manitobans" - this is on the credit side, and goes on to list those who are receiving the supplemental allowances. And then a further quote of the Minister reads as follows: "Nevertheless it is our intention to proclaim the rest of the Act as soon as we are able to do it. We've started a tremendously big program and we believe its philosophy is sound." I say and I want to re-emphasize Mr. Chairman, that the present administration believed that its philosophy was so sound that it won an election on it, back in 1959, but the philosophy has been hidden behind the curtains to a considerable degree ever since. The article goes on to say, "that the success of Manitoba's Social Allowance Act can be gauged from the fact that it's provisions are being copied and adopted in other provinces. We believe that through the Social Allowances Act we have met the needs of thousands of Manitobans who previously had difficulty in obtaining such things as dentures and glasses. Before the Act was passed supplementary assistance to needy groups was almost nil but fortunately these dreadful conditions don't exist today."

Another portion, Mr. Chairman, of the Act that has not yet been fully put into effect is that section of the Act dealing with persons disabled for employment for over 90 days. I'll be interested to hear from the Honourable Minister the degree to which this is now being applied so far as municipalities are concerned in Manitoba. I know that the Minister can tell me, Mr. Chairman, that the Act, or that section of the Act has been proclaimed; but if he can't tell me that it's being effectively operated and applied, then proclamation really doesn't mean too much does it. So I want to hear from the Minister.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether or not one of the barriers to the proclamation of those sections of the Social Allowances Act on which an election was fought, is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I wonder if he is one of those who is guiding the Minister of Welfare and the Tory Government in not proceeding with the full provisions of the Social Allowances Act. And lest I be misunderstood as to why I bring in the Minister of Municipal Affairs, let me refer to a report in the Winnipeg Tribune of January 9th of this year. At that particular time, Mr. Chairman, you may recall that one of the major stories of the day was the so-called Carver case in the Greater Winnipeg area. And I'm not going to go into that particular case, but I was interested in the comments of the Minister of Municipal Affairs respecting a matter of municipal payments for welfare, wherein the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs substantiated and supported the present situation whereby there are so many different standards of municipal aid in the Province of Manitoba. And the Minister of Municipal Affairs stated - according to this news report - and I offer it for comment of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his denial, for at the offset of this report it says: "that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Robert Smellie, today said a change in the law regarding welfare payments in relation to residents would create a dangerous situation." No suggestion, Mr. Chairman, of invoking the clauses that were contained in the speech from His Honour that I referred to a little while ago. But if we had of; we wouldn't have this dangerous situation that the Minister refers to.

Further on in this article, this is stated: " ' However', Mr. Smellie said, 'if the law was changed to make the municipality in which a person currently resides responsible for providing him with financial situation, it would create a situation that would see people moving only to those municipalities which have the best welfare standards.' " I ask my honourable friend, if we had a uniform and reasonable and decent welfare standard in the Province of Manitoba at the provincial level where it justly belongs, would it be necessary for such a statement from the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

And further on, my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs is quoted to say, "If there was no law to stop them, everyone now on welfare would move into Winnipeg to get assistance simply because here" - that's here - "payments are the highest." I refer to this,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). Mr. Chairman, not because of the particular case that it dealt with, but this seems to me to be the approach of the members of the Cabinet opposite - so I repeat once again - here in 1959 in the short minority session, we had His Honour revealing to this House and also to the public of the Province of Manitoba, that one of the objectives of the minority government was to equalize or to relieve the municipal burden insofar as welfare costs were concerned. Following that, in 1959 again, your government, Mr. Minister, won an election to become the majority government, passed the legislation, and still here in the year 1965, despite the fact that at least two Royal Commissions or commissions investigating into the responsibility of this government or the Government of Manitoba and the municipalities, my honourable friend on Christmas Eve, of all days, according to the press statement I had, states: "insofar as certain aspects of the Social Allowances Act the matter will be given consideration and we're working toward the reduction of the four year clause regarding desertions." I'm sure that my honourable friend knows of the case that I have had before him, of an individual in my own city - and I don't think Mr. Chairman, I need to say to him that this is a rather tragic case because of the family situation and the offspring. In this particular case the mother was deserted and she's made every effort to locate her husband, to obtain from him payments out of his veteran's allowance - she can't get this unless he assigns it - but they haven't been able to locate him in order that this might be accomplished. It's true that at the present time the local authority in the City of Transcona is making provision for some welfare and this is appreciated by both the individual concerned and also myself. But the fact still remains, Mr. Chairman, that this government that set out in 1959 with so much flourish and so much flurry, and many of these items still not proclaimed, the bill which allowed them to become the Government of Manitoba.

So I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, if I have been repetitious in dealing with some of the matters that have already been raised, I only join with those honourable members who have raised this question in an appeal to the Honourable Minister to tell us, when, if ever, the Government of Manitoba intends to proclaim those sections of the legislation which was enacted in the second session of 1959, and those sections of The Social Allowances Act which at that particular time seemed to give hope to many people, but such hope has not been realized today in 1965.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps if no one else wishes to speak at this stage, I could make some very brief comments on some of the points that have been raised and I would hope to do that by taking them in reverse order as best I can. Some of them though of course have implications which would possibly require that they best be left at this stage until somewhat later in the debate.

I think if we look at the last comments of the Leader of the NDP, the comments with respect to the Carver family, I think that if we had fully proclaimed the Social Allowances Act, there is nothing in that Act which would have helped out in this particular situation. And I say too that even if we'd had a standard scale of grants as between various municipalities, that this would not have changed the situation with respect to the Carvers, because I think there were other problems within that family which were much deeper and which resulted in the very unfortunate set of circumstances which we all know about.

With respect to the section of the Act which deals with unemployables, we have proclaimed that section and are enrolling that caseload as the new caseload shows up. In other words, any new cases that come along, we're enrolling them first, ultimately we will be taking over all of the caseload that is presently under municipal responsibility.

I think the problem of the proclamation of the remaining sections of The Social Allowances Act can best be considered possibly in relation to the problem that was raised by the Member for Assiniboia, because he was talking about the problem of adoptions which requires highly skilled technical assessment and judgment to be made with respect to each individual case. And the fact that these cases aren't being handled more quickly is the result of the very serious shortage of skilled trained personnel in this field. I think for the same reason we aren't able to get into the balance of The Social Allowances Act which requires individual assessment of cases and individual enrollment of cases. As I mentioned in the opening statement, we are taking steps within the department to better utilize the trained staff that we've got, to make the best use we can of the untrained staff and to take in as many as we can of the new category of individuals who will be graduating from our technical institutes in the field of social work. All of these things are taking place at this time and we hope will enable us to proclaim the remaining sections of the Act, as soon as we can.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).

The Leader of the NDP mentioned a letter to which he did not get a reply for some five months. I must regret that, the letter should have been acknowledged when it came in. Instead of that, the letter was passed along for a report from the Department again, reports take time; normally they don't take anything like five months, in this particular case it happened to. I apologize for the delay and will certainly try to do better in future. I'm completely sympathetic with the case that he drew to our attention. Unfortunately it is not one for which we have accepted responsibility at this time, and they were so informed the municipality, they must look to the municipality for assistance.

Now the Member for Rhineland not in his seat at the moment unfortunately, mentions the case of the erring or deserting husband who returns periodically to visit his family and I would think that he might well ask the question, if he still has this kind of interest in his family why he isn't contributing to their support. Why should he expect the state or for that matter, the municipality, to support the family? Why is he not showing his interest in a more concrete and a more worthwhile way? Because I think that the family here is definitely in trouble. If the lady is not getting support from her husband, if there's no chance of reconciliation, then I think she has to make up her mind, she should seek such action as she can to insure that he doesn't return to the home, if she's genuinely interested in protecting her family.

The case mentioned by the Member for Carillon, I have full sympathy with him. I also recall the statement which he made in discussing the case. He says the municipality don't have the means by which to study these cases and I think on this point he should consult with some of his colleagues because they are the ones who just a few short years ago were telling us that the municipalities were in the best position to judge the needs of the people within their municipality and were best able to help those people who needed help within their municipalities and unfortunately many of them have taken a pretty hardhearted position towards people who are still their responsibility. I know this case well. We have certainly been looking at it very carefully. I don't know the present status of the situation but I understand that we asked our department to make contact with the municipality to see if more equitable arrangements could not be made for the protection of those children. This is one of the real dangers when a municipality does not help a family desperately in need of help, there is the danger of child neglect of course, and all of the repercussions which flow from that. I would hope that the municipalities might be encouraged to exercise a more generous and hospitable view towards the remaining portion of responsibilities that are left with them, because after all the province has already assumed some very high costs and very substantial caseload from them in recent years. You have my undertaking that the remaining sections of the Act will be proclaimed and we'll be stepping in to proclaim the balance of this section as soon as we are able to do so.

The Member for Brokenhead asked about the time limit for which a municipality remained responsible for cases who had moved from their jurisdiction. It's spelled out I believe in the Municipal Act. There is a time limit. I believe it's one year free from assistance and this can be cumulative -- I could check that point and advise him further on it, but that is my understanding that if he remains a part of a municipality without assistance for a period of one year he becomes the responsibility of the new municipality.

The point raised about placing the lien on the home quarter. I think we have gone over this point pretty thoroughly in the past. The simple truth is that we do not place a lien on the home quarter if in fact they are residing there. If they are residing of course in some other place, then this becomes excess assets and may be subject to lien registration. With respect to cars and eligibility, if the person is applying for old age assistance then cars certainly should not be an impediment. It could well be an impediment if they are of course applying for social allowances and that of course depends entirely on the circumstances.

The legal responsibility for children who are in foster homes - this is a subject I suppose for the court. I don't know whether it's ever been determined and decided. I certainly don't think we would be wanting to place any impediments in the way of foster home parents taking children. I would certainly hope that comments like this would not discourage people from coming forward, because foster homes in certain parts of our province are still desperately needed. They are a very important resource for our Children's Aid Societies and in fact for the province itself and they are doing a wonderful service for those young people who have had to be placed with them.

The ward care, the question about the Vaughan Street Detention Home and the placement of children there - this would likely be done by the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg. I'm not

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....sure, I rather suspect that these would be the people who would be responsible. I understand that they are now in the process of considering a receiving home facility to which children such as this could be placed, so that they could remain out of this unhealthy environment.

The question of Assiniboia again, he quotes the City of Winnipeg and the project they have in mind for this year of seven extra workers to help them to more quickly process adoption applications. This I would like to tell him was copied from the program that we ran last year in his area, because we last year took the students who were between first and second year of their course in Social Work at the University of Manitoba, together with supervision that was provided by the University, and ran a special project in our central interlake region which includes Charleswood and Assiniboia. We understand that as the result of this project the applications in that particular region as a whole were double, so there was a very substantial relief in that area.

But we do have a problem here and that is that we have very rapidly expanding suburban areas out there without sufficient adoption children possibly within the area and without sufficient social workers to be able to process the number of applications that are coming forward from that area. This we recognize is a problem. I believe we mentioned last year that we would be looking at boundaries of Children's Aid Societies. Nothing so far has been done but this is still under consideration and we would hope that before too long we will get this situation somewhat better under control. I would hope that the same situation would apply with respect to private adoptions that was mentioned by the Member for Selkirk who was most interested in certifying that these homes are suitable for adoptions where the children have already been placed with them and where strong attachments are beginning to form and I would agree that this possibly should have some priority in our investigation structure.

The Member for St. John's is asking about his \$5 million. As far as I know I don't have any part of it, but I'm not a financial expert, I'm sort of in the dark like he is about that \$5 million, if there is such, if there is such. I would hope that he might direct his question to someone more knowledgeable in the field of finance than myself. --(Interjection)-- He doesn't know any more than the rest of us. Well we're keeping good company all of us!

The question about giving medicare cards to people who may live with relatives. I think the same kind of assessment is done there that's done with respect to any application for Medicare. We try to assess the needs of the particular individual, assess his resources and if there is a short fall then we make up the difference by means of a cash allowance or a medicare card if that is what is required. The same process for anyone living with relatives or in any other place - it's the same kind of assessment process that takes place.

The question about standardization as between various municipalities. This is a very difficult question. I think we recognize that municipalities have certain responsibilities which are there, they're jealous of their responsibilities and I suppose resent the intrusion of senior governments in trying to tell them or advise them or discuss with them how they should be running their responsibilities. We have offered our service to various municipalities who required advice or guidance and things of this kind but -- in this whole particular field I think it's pretty hard to judge the needs, because they are handling to a large extent very short-term cases and a person may be unemployed for two weeks or three weeks or three months and may have other sources of income and they may or may not require clothing, so it's pretty hard to judge what the short-term needs are. Certainly the short-term needs are not nearly so great as the long-term needs so it's pretty difficult to compare this particular category with the category that comes within the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba. And of course, the various municipalities do draw to some extent on private agencies for assistance; a great many church groups or other charitable groups who do provide other assistance. In many cases these people get certain assistance from friends or relatives on a short-term basis. All of these things are factors which don't necessarily apply on a long-term case.

The interest on money - of course, we don't know what the contribution of the municipality will be until it passes that particular point where their outgo exceeds the one mill and until the 80% beyond the one mill exceeds what 40% would bring. So there is a period of time in which we don't know. We understand this is the traditional way of handling it, government financing has usually been done this way. I think we do the same thing by and large in our arrangements with the Government of Canada.

The front of our book. I'm very happy that the Member for St. John's recognized this. This was done by one of the Indian employees in our department. I rather suspect we can see

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). some of the Indian culture here. That looks like some kind of a bone which you might use in making mocassins, the needle and so on. Possibly there is a tie in between the rural isolated environment that he might have come from with the rest of Manitoba - this is only my interpretation. I'm no expert on art and would therefore decline any further comment on it except to say it's a very pleasing design in my opinion.

The Member for Gladstone raised several interesting points. I don't know why for instance he chose to indicate the percentage of workers in the department of Health and Welfare as being 48% of the provincial total because if he refers to the report of the Civil Service Commission he'll find that the Department of Welfare engages 373 persons out of a total of 5,656. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm not answering for the Department of Health. Why didn't you join us up with agriculture or some other department? I suppose there's some reason that you wanted to do this. There are some very real connections between our department and the Department of Health, also with the Department of Education and with several other departments. But I would like to point out to the Committee that we really don't have anything like 48 percent of the staff, or halving that, 24 percent. We have a very much smaller staff although it's a very efficient staff and I think doing a pretty good job.

There were several other questions that he raised. I think he seemed to suggest that we should have more hospital beds. --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I was suggesting how you could make them more readily available - the ones you have now.

MR. CARROLL: Well he said let's build more nursing homes, let's put more people to bed. I think this is really what he is trying to say. Our philosophy of course is to try to keep people within the community, keep them out of bed, keep them out of this kind of an environment. Let's keep them active, let's keep them mobile, let's keep them interested in their community. I think this is the basic philosophy of the. . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: This isn't what I said at all. What I was trying to point up all the time was that there is an acute shortage of hospital beds. There's that on the one hand. On the other hand, according to all authorities, there are altogether too many long-stay patients occupying these critically short hospital beds. The way to relieve this shortage is to put those same patients in alternative care institutions.

MR. CARROLL: I would like to point out to my friend, again he's in the wrong department. If he wants to discuss hospital beds maybe he should've discussed them in the Department of Health.

We are trying of course, under Care Services, to place people in the kind of accommodation that they need most, and this may or may not involve placing them in nursing homes. I think our basic philosophy is to try to keep the people active and in their community. In the past far too many people have gravitated to nursing homes and gone to bed when they might well have been accommodated in hostels or in elderly persons housing, or in their own homes. I think this is the basic difference in philosophy that we want to maximize our efforts to keep people active and healthy and in the community. I think this is a general difference of philosophy between myself and the Member for Gladstone. For instance -- I think possibly I should send you over a copy of our presentation to the Senate Committee on Aging because this philosophy was fully explained. We're trying to support home care programs and activity programs, day centres, visiting services provided by the Age and Opportunity Bureau and others like that; and the specially designed housing that is being provided today where people have those little extra facilities that will enable them to keep healthy and keep active without requiring the assistance of others.

I just want to mention here that I heard just a few months ago about a survey that was done by people who had been making on the average, some 50 to 55 calls to a doctor each year - elderly people who had problems - but they got into an occupational therapy program, an activity program for these people and their number of calls to the doctor decreased to about five a year, in other words you got a 90 percent decrease in the number of calls because these people were active in programs that engaged their interest and their physical capacity and enabled them to get around. I think this sort of illustrates the philosophy that we're trying to follow, trying to keep people going rather than putting them into facilities which they possibly don't need yet. Under our Care Services Program we find that, for instance, during the last year, we've increased the people in home care situations by over 50 percent in the last 12 months. And of course you know that the hospital institutions are being emptied and people are being placed in foster home care, and this is a very important part of this same program.

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

Oh yes, there was one other point that the Member for Gladstone made that I think I should maybe comment on at this time. He mentioned the need for welfare workers without training but with common sense, and I think our approach is that we need both training and common sense. For instance if you need somebody to repair your TV set, you call the guy that's got the practical experience in repairing television sets. And that fellow has to have a minimum education before he can get the kind of knowledge by which he can become qualified in repairing television sets. But I think my honourable friend says you don't need an education to train people.

I was interested a few months ago to hear Dr. Katz discussing children who come into care institutions and I think this sort of illustrates the kind of thing I mean. He said every child that comes into a child caring agency is a disturbed child, and I'll say to my friend that this child needs love and affection and this kind of love and affection can be given by any warm-hearted motherly sort of person or fatherly person, but at the same time that child needs a great deal more. He needs specialized care, he needs specialized help, a great deal more than what this warmhearted person is able to give. I think the same thing applies throughout all this field. We need people who know how to recognize problems and know how to seek the kind of advice and the kind of people that can give them help to solve their special problems; because people who are in trouble aren't generally involved in normal situations - they've been subjected to a great deal of pressure which in many cases involves psychological breakdown or emotional breakdown of one kind or another - and you do need trained people who can recognize these things and offer the kind of advice and assistance that they need. We recognize of course at the same time that there are many other categories of people that can help and we're trying to organize and trying to train the people to give this other kind of help as well.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment a bit on what the Minister had to say about myself when he said I should confer with my colleagues over the fact that I said that municipalities did not have the means to administer welfare. Well I want to say to my honourable friend that I am not one who likes to discuss '58 in '65. I wasn't here in '58 and we're now discussing '65, and the honourable members from my group who were here in '58 sure don't need me to defend their position. They can very ably do it without me. But the point is just this that I said that the provincial welfare have now taken the municipal welfare department to the extent of administering practically all of the welfare in the municipalities except for this part which has to do with deserted mothers, and this is why I said that the municipalities definitely are not going to have a welfare department to administer only this part of the Act and I would strongly suggest that if the provincial welfare administers all other aspects this one should be taken as well.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should send one of the expert social workers of the department around to see my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare and explain a few things to him. I have before me an article - a recent one - that's headed "Welfare Bodies Unite to Fight the Manpower Lack", and I suppose that he had something to do with the article, and it says here that; "They want to introduce" (to overcome this very shortage) "They want to introduce into the welfare field the type of worker who only has a limited professional training. He can be likened to a licensed practical nurse in the health field" and so on and so on. And I said that Bobby Bend was going up and down this province, and has been ever since this government hired him, saying in effect, that there are jobs available, and good jobs available for people with limited specialized educations. Let's rehabilitate more of them. This is what Robbie Bend is saying: Let's rehabilitate more of them. I continue to ask what is this government doing to implement some of the recommendations that my honourable friend Bobby Bend is making at the present time and no doubt will continue to make.

Now Mr. Chairman, I was a little disturbed to not hear the Minister, not hear him and not see him, lay on the desks a new schedule of the Regulations under The Social Allowances Act. The last one that I had - and it was laid on our desk in 1960 by the Minister of Welfare at that time - is it up-to-date? I have it here somewhere. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? No, here it is right here. This was laid on our desk - well it came into force on the 1st day of February, 1960 and it repeals Manitoba Regulation No. 99-57, about five or six pages of what was called Regulations under The Social Allowances Act. Have they been amended since that time and if so why have we not been supplied with the new amended regulations?

Now I suggested earlier today that when this heat tax resolution was before us the Minister got up on two or three different occasions and said "Heating tax on needy is to be offset

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . . the House told by the Welfare Minister." "Carroll promises needy get more to offset heat tax." And in one place in the article here said "the new increased allowances would be made as of the 1st of May" - I believe. So already cheques apparently have gone out, social allowance cheques increased because of new taxes. So there must have been an amendment, there must have been a change in the regulations even in the last month to take care of the new taxes. I suggested too at that time, Mr. Chairman, that in consideration of the way that an application for Social Allowance is calculated or considered, then there must be a whole group of people who did not qualify because of the fact that their income exceeded their outgo by two or three dollars, now, with the increased taxes, they will come into the fold and qualify for Social Allowance - there must be. And my honourable friend didn't tell me or did not tell the committee yet, what is the smallest social allowance cheque issued and what is the largest social allowance cheque issued. I think it would be interesting to have that.

Then he was going to tell the committee too, what new regulations that are presently out in respect to elderly persons' housing. Now I think it is absolutely no secret that a number of communities in the Province of Manitoba hope to build alternative care institutions - call them whatever you like, Mr. Chairman - alternative care institutions as Centennial projects. I know they're building one in Gladstone. I don't know how many more they're building in the province and I do know that in the Town of Neepawa we are building one. Now what are the regulations in regard to infirm beds, the percentage of semi-ambulant beds or infirm beds - call them what you like. I don't know what term my honourable friend applies and that's why, Mr. Chairman, I'm using the term "alternative care institutions" because that embraces all of these various types. I know that for about three or four years in Neepawa, and I said this before, while the Town of Neepawa were custodians of certainly sufficient money to start a program off, they were prevented from doing so because the government would not make grants available if they intended to build "infirm" beds as part of the institution. I believe all that has been changed.

I have an article before me from the Neepawa Press, a year ago, it says: "Government decision needed" and points up exactly what I have said. They were waiting with \$33,000; they've had it for three or four years; they couldn't use it and carry out the conditions and terms of the Will - they couldn't use it until the government introduced new legislation to make grants available where they were building not only elderly persons housing but alternative care institutions.

My honourable friend seems to think, or suggested when he spoke in rebuttal to what I said, that you got immediately up out of a hospital bed and you walked away and you didn't go back into any other kind of a bed. There's thousands of people in this province yet, according to all the reports that I have, who are occupying valuable hospital beds, that could be taken care of just as well in alternative care institutions. Now when I raised that point he suggested I should take that up with the Minister of Agriculture, or he said that he wanted to divorce them. He said, "I've got nothing to do with the Health Department". Why bring this up under his estimates? Well they're correlated. Yesterday the Minister of Industry and Commerce wanted to sic us on the Minister of Agriculture. Well, he's going to have problems of his own when we get to his estimates - no doubt somebody will have something to say to him. It's pretty difficult, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the health and welfare of the people of this province without mentioning the Minister of Health now and again, even if my honourable friend isn't on speaking terms with him, and he sounds as if he wasn't.

So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my honourable friend could give us some definite answers to some of the questions that we've put to him. I think that he hasn't answered all of the ones that have been put to him by my honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead yet either.

--(Interjection)-- "No he hasn't", he says, so there's still some questions that we would like to have answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) -- passed

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the procedure of estimates here would be quite pointless unless we had an opportunity to come back at the Minister when his answers are inadequate or not to the point. Now with regard to the matter of the limitation of municipal responsibility for welfare cases, the Minister suggested that a municipality was responsible for the welfare payments to a family when it moves to another municipality, only up to a period of one year. This is misleading because it is true that if a family moves out of a municipality and takes up residence in another municipality and then subsequently if that family goes on welfare, the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). original municipality is responsible only if that family goes on welfare in the first year of residence outside. However, what about those tens of cases - I would say hundreds of cases - where a family is already on welfare, living in a municipality and then moves out to another municipality. It can never - that family never does establish residence in a second or subsequent municipality and so the municipality of the first instance must continue to bear the financial responsibility for the welfare of that family for years without limit. There is no limitation and I think that this should be changed and I would hope that the Minister will look at this with a view to recommending legislation for the next session of this Assembly. It doesn't make sense that a municipality should be held responsible for the welfare of a family after that family has lived for 9, 10 or 12 years in some subsequent municipality.

Secondly, the Minister suggested that if a person applies for Old Age Assistance and owns an old car, that this car is no impediment in his qualifying for Old Age Assistance. But he suggested that if the application were one for Social Allowance, that a car, an old car, might very well be an impediment toward eligibility and I question this policy or regulation because in rural Manitoba where somebody may live 14 miles, 17 miles from town, a car is an absolute necessity; it cannot be viewed as a luxury in my opinion. I would agree that if the car were five years, or newer, that it could very well be considered an impediment, a just impediment. But if the car is an old one, it provides transportation and there's no great value in it, only a couple of hundred dollars, why take this as being an impediment for qualification for Social Allowance. I think this should be looked at.

Thirdly, the Minister says that it is not the policy of his department to place a lien on the home quarter section of a welfare recipient - mother's allowance recipient or disability allowance or old age assistance allowance. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that there is a technical problem here because I think - I accept the Minister's statement that the department does not put a lien on the home quarter. However I do know of cases, personally, where liens are put on land that is part of the first 160 acres. For example, if a widowed mother has her home on a quarter section in one block, no lien is placed. However if a widowed mother and her children are living in a house on 30 acres and owns 130 acres or 120 acres across the road and down the road away, it's true no lien is placed on the home 30 but a lien is placed on the 120 across the road and down the road a piece. And I don't think this is right. The policy should rather be one of a basic 160-acre exemption from a lien. This is the only way that you can arrive at fairness. I think it's rather silly that one should have an exemption from a lien on her home quarter and the next one has an exemption only on 30 acres and the balance of 130 is - a lien is placed. Where is the consistency there? I think that that's a policy matter that should be clarified.

And next, the Minister suggests that the Children's Aid Society is responsible for receiving home facilities for young foster children in transit, as it were, between their home and a foster home that is being made ready for them. Now it's true that the Children's Aid Society is responsible. This is a volunteer agency and it's doing good work but it's hampered by shortage of staff and also hampered by its budget. Whatever the function and role of a volunteer agency may be, such as is the Children's Aid Society, one function it should not be expected to assume is the cost of capital construction or acquisition of property for a receiving home. This is something - the capital cost of a receiving home, either construction or acquisition, is something that a volunteer agency should not be expected to assume. If there is a shortage of receiving home facilities for these young children in this province - and there is - it is not the fault of the volunteer agency but rather the fault of this government. I am not saying that this government should assume or usurp the function of the Children's Aid Society and other volunteer agencies, but capital costs of facilities, that is something the government cannot or should not shove off on a volunteer agency. And if it's been doing so until now, I suggest it should re-think its policy in this regard. How can you expect a volunteer agency to be able to muster this kind of money for capital purposes?

And finally, before I take my seat, there is this question which the Honourable Member for Gladstone raises. He has raised it twice now and he has received no satisfactory answer on that. And that is this question of alternative care. Now the Minister says what, that this is a purview of the Department of Health. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, alternative care is, it seems to me, in the transitional zone between the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare and it could just as well be handled or discussed here. The government's record - and in order to revoke some response, I shall make a provocative statement; namely,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) that this government's record in Health and Welfare, while good in many respects, is particularly dismal with regard to alternative care facilities, and as long as it is a dismal record, the fact will be that hospital beds will be taken up by people who could, who could be done just as well by, if nursing home type facilities were made more available.

Now the Minister just before he took his seat last time he rose, said that he is not enamoured of the idea of nursing home care facilities, that the philosophy of his department was undergoing transition to one of endorsement of the idea of occupational therapy, and keeping the elderly people more active etc. This is all very good, it sounds enlightened and so on, but the fact is that many elderly people are not in the condition to respond to this sort of thing and they do in fact require extensive type care facilities or accommodation, and in Winnipeg it may work to try these new approaches but in rural Manitoba the density of population etc. and a variety of factors almost prohibit this kind of an approach. Now the Minister himself said not very long ago that this government or his department was trying to keep these people in their community which was a very noble idea. Well a lot of people could be kept in their community if in these regions nursing home or alternative care facilities were provided. But they are not provided, Mr. Chairman. In all of eastern Manitoba, east of the Red River, between the Red River and the Ontario boundary there is not, there isn't one alternative care type facility to be had or to be found, and I think that there should be at least one or two on a regional basis. This is an area which has received no attention from this government. It's being left as a sort of orphan area uncared for, and the result is that hospital beds are in short supply. This is one of the factors contributing to it.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Honourable Member for Brokenhead mention automobiles a couple of times and I couldn't hesitate but give my opinion too. His opinion has been that probably the department are a little too strict insofar as welfare families having the use of an automobile. As far as I'm concerned, I feel this is right, proper, where an automobile is necessary. I'm thinking of someone that's afflicted with arthritis and that sort of thing and need an automobile to get from here to there. But I'm sure the Honourable Member from Brokenhead has noticed this here and there, that he'll agree with me that public opinion is very much against families on welfare riding around in automobiles. For some reason or other he didn't mention this, but this is happening, and I know for a fact that the department in its wisdom has tried to control this matter and they see no reason why a family drawing welfare, living on the public purse as it were, and operating an automobile, oh - not five years old, probably a little more recent vintage, obtained as they may have obtained it, but at least going around and enjoying this pleasure that they could very well get along without. He mentions the people in rural Manitoba that have their farms and they're on welfare. I would remind him that under The Welfare Act that as a farmer, no matter how small it may be, they are entitled to certain privileges in their farm life which in some instances possibly requires them to have an automobile to take the cream to town and that sort of thing; but I don't think that the department in all fairness, have been any too rough in this particular direction. I think they have tried in all honesty in the majority of cases to see to it that the privilege of receiving welfare does not entail the driving of an automobile for pleasure and all those things that go with it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know to what extent the Honourable Member for Swan River enunciates departmental and government policy on the question of welfare. I wonder if the Minister too thinks that a person who receives welfare is the recipient of a privilege, if this is a privilege that he has and that he should not abuse by enjoying the pleasure of riding around in an automobile. I'm not sure just what is the yardstick which is used by the Honourable Member for Swan River. He says horse and buggy - I imagine that there are people, of which he may be one, who living in the horse and buggy era would enjoy more the horse and buggy ride for pleasure than the automobile. But the only policy which he has enunciated so far is one dealing with public opinion and I think it might be interesting to hear the Minister tell us whether that is the formula which is used in welfare - public opinion - or the theory of privilege given to welfare recipients. I ask this rather seriously because I don't think he answered the questions which I asked dealing with formula or yardstick used in Welfare.

The reasons he advanced for a continuation of a discrepancy between various municipal decisions as to welfare amounts was that the people in the municipalities like to feel that they make their own decisions as to how to operate, and this then means that this government's

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). policy is to let the policy be determined by the municipal leaders in whatever municipality is involved in it. And if that is the case then where is the leadership which I called upon before. Shall we admit now that there is no leadership in this, that this department is a bookkeeping department which receives money and distributes it - albeit quite late, albeit a year late, albeit at a cost of interest charges to the municipalities - but still distributes it as a bookkeeper does receiving statements and calculating 40 percent and 80 percent and then issuing cheques. I still don't see that I was answered in my question of what formulae are used, what leadership is given to municipalities to indicate what they should do.

Now for example, do all the municipalities have the same attitude to automobiles that the Honourable Member for Swan River has or do just some of the municipalities have that? Do others use horse and buggy as a criteria or do some say this is a privilege which you may have, but if you had lived in an adjoining municipality, it was not a privilege you were permitted. I think that after two years, and after we have had a separation of the Department of Health and Welfare to give a full-time Minister an opportunity to develop policy and standards, that it is time we had it and I think that we are running out of the excuse that we still don't have enough trained workers. I've a hunch that the answer might be once we have enough trained workers is that the municipalities don't want trained workers because they know better by themselves how to administer this problem. I suggest that if there is a shortage I'm not aware that the department and the government is really doing something to take care of the shortage. If there is a shortage something must be done to remedy the shortage. But even while there is a shortage and while it is necessary for amateurs to be involved in the decisions on a municipal level that there must be a great deal more direction by the government.

Now there was also discussion as to the formula used in Medicare and I think I got a pretty vague answer to that and that was that the Department measures the needs and the ability and the means of the people involved and on that basis decides on Medicare. But I have been given a formula that is very exact, and in case the Honourable Minister doesn't know it, I'll tell it to him, so he'll know what his department has informed me is their formula.

In the case of a person, a woman in this case, living with a child and not paying any rent, the department calculates that board and room for that person costs \$45 a month; that clothing for that person costs \$5 per month; that the personal needs of that person amount to \$5 a month; and then a word which I have written down as "leeway" \$5 a month - and that is I suppose, if they don't have a car they have to hire a horse and wagon and if they do have a car maybe its for gas - but in any event this \$5 - Pardon?

MR. BILTON: Buggy that is, not wagon.

MR. CHERNIACK: Horse and buggy, not wagon.

MR. CARROLL: This was for the lady herself, not for her child.

MR. CHERNIACK: Correct.

MR. CARROLL: And she was living with a relative.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: A close relative

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, a close relative and no one dependent on this lady - she herself, for herself was allowed \$45 board and room, \$5 for clothing, \$5 for personal needs, \$5 for just anything, and as being a recipient of old age pension and getting \$75 a month, therefore was presumed to have \$15 extra left over at the end of these necessities which I have described which total \$60. Now out of the \$15 she has paid her doctor - but she didn't need a doctor because according to the departmental theory she could go to the out-patients department where its free - so anything she paid the doctor was just a luxury really, because she didn't have to do that. But she did need drugs, and this case came to my attention because the druggist said to me that knowing the circumstances of this woman it seemed to him that she ought to have a medicare card. Well I discovered that the problem was that this druggist was so considerate of her that he was charging her a wholesale price of drugs and that same did not amount to \$15 a month. Had he been charging the retail price, which he did soon after I had a little talk with him, then the cost was over \$15

MR. CARROLL: double the price

MR. CHERNIACK: Pardon? --(Interjection)-- Well I have confidence that the retail druggist is a man that does not take unfair advantage of government or of the populous generally. --(Interjection)-- Well I think that this druggist dealt fairly with it and therefore

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). charged a fair price, but once it amounted to over \$15 because he was charging retail rather than contributing to her support by charging wholesale, she thereupon qualified for medicare and got her doctor paid for her, her optical care, her dental care, her drug care and the whole world opened up for her, because of that \$15 for drugs. This is a formula which is not based on the Honourable Minister's general formula of need and means but rather a pretty ironclad one. I'd love to hear clarification of it.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, isn't that really need when her expenses went beyond her income of \$75.00, she was

MR. CHERNIACK: By \$1.00? By \$1.00

MR. CARROLL: By whatever.

MR. McLEAN: committee might 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 the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: 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 8:00 o'clock Tuesday evening.