

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 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

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. JOHNSON: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Committee reads as follows: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Education Department Act and the Public Schools Act by providing for supplying of textbooks for use by pupils attending private schools and for permitting boards of trustees of public schools to provide to children enrolled in private schools services and facilities offered by the public schools, as a result of which further expenditures will be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund. Mr. Chairman, this measure is necessary as it calls for the expenditure of public funds to carry out the intent of the Shared Services legislation, the report of which has been before the House and which has received concurrence in principle at that stage. It's very difficult, of course, to estimate the exact costs of such a measure, but the monies in the budget of the Department of Education, it's entirely possible that throughout the year that there will be monies available for this purpose. If not, extra monies will be supplied, I trust, for the carrying out. We have no way of estimating the extent of this. In the field of textbooks we have an indication of the number of children involved; in transportation, many children will require no transportation. Others will, of course. We have no idea as to the extent to which each division will use transportation. The main factors here would be the cost of the textbooks and the present programs being undertaken, especially the program in effect in the Winnipeg School Division involving 300 students, 287 to 300 students, taking Home Ec and Industrial Arts. There, for example, the closest estimate I can get from the department would be a very modest sum per year for each one concerned. I wish I could be more specific but it's pretty difficult at this time to estimate precisely the extent to which public funds will be involved.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions. I just wonder whether I read the resolution properly. In the first place, as I read it, textbooks will be given to all students or pupils attending a separate school - No. 1. No. 2, a public school, the trustees of a public school can offer all the services they have within it to any children from a separate school that wish to attend. No. 3, if children so do attend, will the government make the usual grants for such children attending a public school?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make one observation and I would like to ask the Minister one question as I read this resolution. First, the observation - I am disappointed in the Minister and the government in laying before us this resolution at this stage of the Session. The Committee on Shared Services met at the commencement, or just prior to the commencement of this Session, and some members of that Committee proposed a report to this Assembly. We've been in session some 40 or 50 days and it wasn't until yesterday or the day before that the report was finally voted on insofar as concurrence. During the hearings of the Committee on Shared Services a considerable number of briefs were presented by interested groups and individuals. It does not appear to me that there will be adequate time for these people and groups to make representation before the Committee to deal with any legislation, or the legislation that is being proposed by the government. So I want to protest, Mr. Chairman, to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). Committee, or to the government, because of this.

I also want the Honourable the Minister of Education to clarify the resolution that we are now considering, because one of the three principles which was first of all enunciated by the First Minister, was that services to pupils of private schools would be provided for them at the public schools. As I read the resolution it appears to me that this is not contained within the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Minister of Education. If we look closely at the resolution we find that in the first part, ". it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Education Department Act and the Public Schools Act by providing for supplying of textbooks for use by pupils attending private schools." (1). "And for permitting boards of trustees of public schools to provide to children enrolled in private schools services and facilities offered by the public schools." There is no qualifying phrase in the resolution which would substantiate one of the principles enunciated by the First Minister at the time the proposition on Shared Services was first presented to the House a year ago last February. So I would like to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Education whether this is an omission in the phraseology or whether there has been a still further departure from the three principles first of all enunciated by the First Minister on the introduction of the whole proposition to this Assembly over a year ago.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I have only two rather minor and specific questions. I would ask the Minister if it is the intention that this legislation, if and when passed, will take effect for the next school year, that is to say starting September, 1965; and secondly, since the Minister was unable to give much specific information as to estimate of expenditure, I would ask simply if the expenditure is to be covered by supplementary estimates at the next session or if it's being provided for somewhere in the current estimates. I suppose I should know this but I'm a little confused on that point.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a couple of questions. I understand that the grants will go to the school boards, specific school boards, from the government. I wonder how these grants will be arrived at, how they'll be figured. The grants for instance for the transportation, if the bus could not go out of its way at all to pick up the child that attends private school, or that it has to -- the students will have to disembark at the public school. I wonder what kind of proportionate grants that will be and -- of course this is just the first reading. I think we'll have a better chance to see more about this. From the way this was explained so far, the publicity that this has received, I think that the Minister should reconsider the business of the transportation. I think this is the best way to try to promote or to try, to see that you'll have second class citizens if all of a sudden a certain group of students are told to get out and walk the rest of the way or they'll have to walk before they get to the bus. I think that if it's true that some of these, that everybody in Manitoba, if they're entitled to part of something, to all of something, they're entitled to part of something, in the words that were said in this House by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that this is something that they deserve, that is their right. I can't see how this can be done. And I also think that the government should think twice before pushing the responsibility after stating some principle that the shared services has, having the benefit of two different - a committee and a commission - that I think that it is unwise to place the responsibility on the local school board.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I note that according to this resolution that it's going to be permissible legislation, that as far as I can see there would be no coercion on any school boards that refuse to give this service. If I am wrong, then I hope the Minister will correct me.

MR. JOHNSON: the question, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, the textbooks would be paid through the divisional boards as now done for public schools - for private and parochial schools within that division - and proportionate grants would be paid for those services offered in the public school, to the students from the private and parochial schools. That leads into the second question, the Honourable Leader of the NDP. The principle is not broached that he was speaking about. The whole matter, I think, will be quite clear when you see the bill, when we get the bill before the House, in that it will clarify this particular area for the honourable member.

I think the bill should be on proclamation, which would enable us hopefully to be able to participate by the next school year. The grants of course, it is true, go to the school boards on a per pupil basis and on a proportionate basis, and where transportation is offered on the normal divisional bus routes to students from private and parochial schools wishing -- or

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) where the division offers this transportation on their bus route, the transportation grants, of course, are calculated as we know, 60 percent up to \$100 per year per student. Some areas, of course, transportation, where it is not offered to the students in attendance at private and parochial schools, would not be -- there would be no transportation costs. In other words, everything is dealt with through the public school authority. I think several of these matters will be clear as you see the actual bill before you specifically. The necessary monies to -- it's pretty hard to estimate or to advise you at this juncture just what the cost might be, but it will be largely texts and providing those services that -- we've very little indication at the moment to what extent divisions might offer such services. We know that for those services now in effect the cost would not be great other than possibly for textbooks.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, because usually on second reading we're pretty well confined to the principle contained in the bill, I have a further question arising out of the answer given by the Honourable Minister to one of my questions. If I understood him rightly, he said that the public schools that would accept children from separate schools would be paid either on a per child, per student basis, or a proportionate sum. My understanding of the present grants is that they're made to public schools per teacher. Per teacher - not per pupil. Is that right? That's the way the grants are made to the public schools at the present time? And if there are a certain number of pupils you get a grant for one teacher, up to a certain number. Now my question is this, Mr. Chairman: Supposing in the public school you have five children less than the maximum allowable for one teacher grant, and there are five children come in from a separate school, still within the number allowable, will that grant be increased because of the additional pupils? That's question number one. Question number two: supposing the number of pupils that come in from a separate school exceed the maximum requirements for one teacher, will the government give a grant to this school equivalent to that of another teacher grant, if the number for one is exceeded?

MR. JOHNSON: I think, Mr. Chairman, these are questions which really I haven't given that much detailed thought to, other than to say that we would make some provision with the Division on a proportionate basis. For example, a child may just come for Industrial Arts and Home Ec on a part-time basis that will make a class over the pupil count that we authorize for a full grant. I think we would have to make a provision with the Division on the same basis as we'd make it for any other child. Do you get what I mean? And if on a full-time basis, of course the child is counted in the same way as any other public school student. I think this is the intent of the bill that will be before us.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a further question. Every time that the Honourable the Minister has answered any question, he has referred to the school body as being the Division. Does he also -- are the other boards, school boards, precluded from this legislation? Or I'll put it in the positive. Does this only apply to school divisions as such?

MR. JOHNSON: Those school divisions and districts, as will be defined by the legislation with - as we said, the spelling out the safeguards to the public school system, as contained roughly in that report that was before us. That is -- do you understand what I. The answer is yes, anyway.

MR. PAULLEY: suggest that it only applies to school divisions?

MR. JOHNSON: Districts and divisions that qualify under the legislation that will be before us.

MR. PAULLEY: not qualify under the legislation?

MR. JOHNSON: Not at the moment. I think when we see the bill before us, we have listed as appendices all the schools that are now in operation - all those private schools throughout the province who come under the bill at the present time. Now, in the future of course, schools have to reach a certain size in an area or there has to be a certain school population before the services can be offered.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister will permit this question. Have any of the school divisions or school districts that are going to be involved by this legislation been taken into the confidence of the government, and what is their reaction to the specific contents of the bill which you intend to bring into this House? I think it's very important that this House know what the reaction is of these divisions and districts, because they're the people who have to work out the solution to this thorny problem. It's easy enough for us to bring in legislation, but they're the people, the practical people, who have to interpret this and to enforce it, and for that reason I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this matter

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). is a little bit precipitant, and I think that this Committee on Shared Services should be reconstituted, and whatever bill is drafted should be referred to that Committee so that the interested parties could get together and determine whether or no, in their opinion, that is a workable arrangement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted a certain resolution and has instructed me to report the same.

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. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 141, an Act to amend The Education Department Act and The Public Schools Act (2).

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

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. I asked him yesterday about the request from Alexander to be included in the Brandon exchange, and he mentioned then that he would be looking into it and would have a reply soon. I wonder if he has anything to report on the matter.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I said that I had received a request and had referred it to the Telephone System, and I still haven't a report from them on what their decision is.

While I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I was asked two other questions today with regard to the purchase of power from Ontario and Saskatchewan. I'll have that answer a little later on this evening. I haven't got it right now and I was hoping.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would ask him if he has received a large number of complaints relative to the operation of the Manitoba Potato Marketing Board - that is to say, a large number of complaints according to his opinion of what is large or small.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): I don't know, Madam Speaker, what he will think of my opinion, but in my opinion, in my estimate, we have received a minimum of complaints.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 34 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the NDP Party, and a return to an Order of the House No. 52 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister concerned when we can expect the report from the Denturist Committee.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Soon.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a subsequent question? Are they planning any safaris to New Zealand or are they remaining in Canada?

MR. WITNEY: Not this year, Madam Speaker. We feel that the climate in Manitoba is quite propitious and we're prepared to stay here.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between: 1. Mr. D. H. Bain, The D. H. Bain Estate, and the Manitoba Government, re conservation, goose preserves and properties at Grant's Lake and Delta, since 1960. 2. The Manitoba Government solicitors, Pitblado, Hoskin and/or Mr. G. R. Hunter, and the Manitoba Government, re properties at Grant's Lake, Delta and Portage la Prairie owned by Mr. D. H. Bain and the D. H. Bain Estate, since 1960. 3. The Manitoba Government and/or its solicitors, and any other parties not mentioned in 1. and 2, regarding the properties at Grant's Lake, Delta and Portage la Prairie.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, we're prepared to accept Question 1 and Question 3. Question 2 requests privileged information - that is, information from a solicitor to the Crown.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Details of all offers to purchase made to owners of property in the Oak Lake Project area and the Pipestone Creek area, showing in particular (a) the date the offer was made (b) the amount offered (c) the legal description and the location of the property (d) the person or persons to whom the offer was made (e) whether the offer was verbal or written.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, subject to the usual reservations about confidential matters within the department, we are prepared to give this information.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: Details of all purchases of property in the Oak Lake Project area and the Pipestone Creek area, showing in particular: 1. The legal description and location of property. 2. The name and address of persons or corporations from whom purchased. 3. The date of the purchase. 4. The amount paid. 5. By whom legal fees were paid. 6. If paid by the government, the amount of the legal fees and the persons to whom paid. 7. Whether the purchase was by negotiation or by expropriation.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Subject to the reservation I stated in the case of the earlier

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced for the month of March, 1965, at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Brandon, Manitoba. 2. The cost and amount of fuel burned at the above station in the month of March, 1965. 3. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced in the month of March, 1965, at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Selkirk, Manitoba. 4. The cost and amount of fuel burned at the above station in the month of March, 1965. 5. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity purchased in the month of March, 1965, by Manitoba Hydro from outside the Province of Manitoba, stating from whom purchased.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order, a point of information perhaps. It is my opinion that an Order for Return once voted in this Assembly does not lapse with the prorogation of the Assembly, and I would like to ask the House Leader if it is a fact that an Order for Return once voted must be provided, even after prorogation.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge):not the case, that it must be re-voted at the next session.

MR. DESJARDINS:we ask what the intention of the government is on that, the different departments. It's no use taking these Orders if you don't intend to give any--(interjection)--What's the answer? It would be easier if he'd talk a little louder.

MR. MOLGAT: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I was rather surprised to hear the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources say there's no point bringing them in. I suspect that this is the attitude of the government. These Orders for Returns, Madam Speaker, are put in for a very specific purpose, and that is to provide information to the House, and for the Minister to say there's no point in putting them in I think is a reflection of the attitude of the Minister particularly, and of a number of his colleagues, in respect of providing information

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). to the members of the House, and certainly in the past on some of the Orders requested from him in particular, there has been serious dereliction of duty in providing the information.

I think that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has a very good point. The motion was moved by the House. I think the government can say that there is no session to whom they can give the Order once this House prorogues, but when the House again meets then the House is in session, and any orders requested from a previous session should be submitted to the subsequent session because it is an Order of this House; it's an Order of this House to provide the information. It does not lapse with the House. It should be given at the next session, and if my honourable friend instead of talking out of order, as he frequently does, would check what goes on in other legislatures, he will find that in other jurisdictions the information is provided as at the subsequent session.

MR. EVANS: It has always been the custom here in my experience to have the Orders lapse and they have always been re-voted and the information provided in the subsequent session that way.

MR. PAULLEY: exception, if I may enter into this, Madam Speaker. In the past, out of courtesy, the government has forwarded Orders of Return after the session has prorogued. This has been done and I would suggest that the government would consider that on any Orders that are now being asked or for which returns have not as yet been made.

MR. DESJARDINS: We could repeat that same question. What is the intention of the different Ministers? These motions are accepted and then the Minister tells us that it's no use putting it in. I think that we should know if it is the intention to accept this, and if not, if we are not going to get the answer, then the Minister should refuse to accept these motions.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say that on my part, as a Minister, I accept the Order and if it's possible in the time remaining of this sitting of the Legislature, the honourable members will get the information. If the staff in the department are unable to bring this information together within the time remaining in this session of the Legislature, then the members won't; but I think we will act in good faith and keep faith with the members.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 116 --

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I cannot hear what the Honourable Minister is saying. I wish that the members would lower their voices.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills listed in the Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bill No. 116 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 119.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, before passing the reporting of this bill, I would like to object to the passing of the bill on the ground that I consider this legislation to be highly improper, as it deals with a matter in respect of which litigation is imminent. Now I don't know whether the government was aware at the time of introducing this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: the honourable member's aware that subsection (3) has been struck out?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'm aware of that, fully aware of that. As I was saying, I don't know whether the government was aware at the time of introducing this bill on what the situation was in connection with the pending litigation, but it would appear to me, Mr. Chairman, that the government must have had some knowledge of that pending litigation, otherwise it would not have that subsection (3) in which reads "This section shall be conclusively deemed to have always been the law." In other words, that legislation was intended to deal with something which was coming before our courts; otherwise that subsection (3) would never have been put in there.

But apart from that altogether, whether the government did know or whether the

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) government did not know, the government knows now that there is litigation which is about to take place in our courts, and it's true that this bill will only become law upon proclamation, yet nevertheless, the minute this House passes this bill, it is expressing an opinion on what the law should be, and to that extent I think it's wrong in principle to make such an expression, particularly when this matter is going to be thrashed out in our courts for the purpose of determining that law.

We in this House are forbidden to discuss matters that are sub judice, and I think that is quite proper; we should not be allowed to discuss these matters. And by the same principle, I think it's highly improper for this Legislature to introduce and to pass legislation, whether it comes in by proclamation or by Royal Assent, which in any way deals with or reflects upon any matter which is coming into our courts to be determined by due process of law.

Now Mr. Newman, the solicitor for one of the litigants, said he was going ahead with it, and this legislation was brought into this House for the express purpose of relieving his client, and the litigation that he has in court now is to test the law. But if we enact this bill, whether we proclaim it now or bring it in later - or at least whether we bring it in by Royal Assent or by proclamation - we are expressing on behalf of the people of Manitoba what we consider the law to be or what the law should be, and I think that that is a highly improper action for us to take in view of this pending litigation.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult, if I may say so, to understand the line of argument being pursued by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. With the amendment to the bill, removing what would be regarded as the retroactive feature of the bill, we remove I think any possibility that this particular legislation will affect the case to which reference has been made -- was made in the Committee, and has been made here, so that if that was wrong the wrong has been righted and we are then, I think, not in any -- have no problem.

With respect to the balance of the bill, in that particular section, in the two subsections, it at the very most could be said to be declaratory of the law, and Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Selkirk wants to know what we believe the law to be, he needs only to look at the bill, because we do very sincerely and firmly believe that that, in effect, states what the law is, and aside altogether from the particular case, which is obviously excluded insofar as this bill is concerned once the retroactive feature has been removed, the legislation when it becomes operative will affect all other policies that are in force and which are not the subject of legislation but where, Mr. Chairman, we believe it to be in the public interest that the situation be clearly stated; and that's the purpose of the legislation, and that indeed is our duty. If it has come to our attention that there is any misunderstanding about what the law ought to be concerning, in this case, insurance contracts, then I would think that it would be our duty and responsibility to act in such way as we consider advisable, so that far from being improper, the legislation, believing as we do that it correctly sets out the policies, the practice, the understanding that has been followed these many years in Manitoba in relation to insurance contracts but which it has now been suggested may not be the case, that we are acting properly. And we have excluded - and I repeat it again - we have excluded the one particular matter which may be - indeed I take it, which will be - the subject of litigation, leaving that matter to be decided by the courts.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to thank the Honourable the Attorney-General for clarifying my own argument. He has made the very point that I'm trying to make, namely, that this matter is in the process of being litigated. One side alleges a certain set to be the law, and another side alleges the other angle to be the law. The Honourable the Attorney-General says that this bill actually reflects what this House considers to be the law, and that's the very point that I'm trying to make; that we are expressing an opinion, whether we proclaim this Act or not at this very time, but we are expressing an opinion of what we consider to be the law, and I think that's highly improper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8 (a) -- passed --

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I'm sure my friend the Attorney-General must agree with the point that the Honourable Member for Selkirk is making. Here we have a case coming to court. That case in court is going to be argued on what is really the intention of the present law, and we heard at the committee meeting very eminent counsel differ diametrically on what is the effect of the present law. Now, they say they are going to court on this matter. They've given us the assurance that they'll be going in any case, but if we pass - in the meantime if this Legislative Assembly passes an Act that shows that we

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). say that the law is thus and so, does my honourable friend not feel that that will have some influence on that case? True, we've taken out the retroactive feature so that as far as what we pass being the law that applies to that case, my honourable friend the Attorney-General is quite correct, but won't the fact that the Legislative Assembly, regardless of how well we have considered the matter, if we say that this is the law, won't that have an effect on the case?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, not to prolong this, I just pose to the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable the Member for Selkirk a question, and it's not really a question that I expect them to answer; but look at the dilemma in which you are suggesting we place ourselves. We believe, as I have already stated, that persons who rely upon insurance contracts are entitled to certain protection as it would appear, even from the limited evidence given before the Committee, has always been considered to be the case and to be equitable and that sort of thing. Now, that being so, and on the other hand we're on notice that evidently some insurance companies may feel that this is not the case. Are the honourable members suggesting - and as I say, this is a rhetorical question -- are they suggesting that because there is one particular case which we know is going to be the subject matter of litigation, are they suggesting that because of that that we should fail in our duty to set clearly as we can what we consider to be the equitable principles that should apply and take our chances that perhaps one, perhaps more, who knows, innocent persons who are not known to us at this time, and who may not be the subject of litigation, that innocent persons are harmed thereby? You pose a question and I pose one right back at you as to what our duty is under those particular circumstances and I say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that it is our duty and we recognize the -- I suppose one would say that the side effects that there may or may not be, I can't say what the effect will be, but that there may be on the particular case in question -- but surely that doesn't absolve us from doing our duty under the circumstances.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it's not as open and shut as my honourable friend the Attorney-General would have us to believe as to what our legal advisors take the present law to be because we had a very able counsel arguing with, what I thought, very good effect that he was convinced that that was not the law at the present time. There wouldn't be this case coming up to court if there wasn't a disagreement on this point so at least we know there's a disagreement. Now we have the evidence of all the lawyers -- I think this is one thing on which they all agree -- that there has been no case of this kind in Canada, not one that they could find, on a parallel with this that's happened now. Surely we're not taking much of a chance of harming the public if we allow this to wait until after this other case is held and isn't it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that one of the counsels who came there said that he had a letter. He admitted it was personal, but he had a letter from the Superintendent of Insurance of the Treasury Department, saying in effect that this legislation was unnecessary. Is that not a fact? Yes it is a fact. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact. That's what Mr. Walter Newman, Q.C., said. He read us excerpts of a letter from March 26th, 1965, and he said -- and I can't quote his words exactly, but I can certainly quote the sense of it. He said, and the unfortunate thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this letter was written on the 26th of March, 1965, and he was of course arguing his side of the case and he didn't agree with the position that the Superintendent of Insurance was taking there but the Superintendent of Insurance had evidently made it very plain to him in that letter that his opinion was that this legislation was unnecessary, that no harm would take place in the meantime because there had been no case; no one of the lawyers could find a case in Canada paralleling this. Mr. Newman had found two cases in the United States and he told us about two of them.

Now why not let this case go to court? That's going to happen anyway. But why not us hold up this legislation in the meantime? We have the assurance of everybody, plus common sense I think, that no harm will be taken. Of course if the Honourable the Attorney-General is right, that it's up to us to protect the position of the insured people but, on the other hand, the possibility of anything untoward happening seems to be so remote that we'd be taking no chance by sending this section also to the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. And I appreciate the fact that it is the intention of the government to not proclaim this immediately and this is a compromise to some extent, I admit. But I suggest to the government through you, Mr. Chairman, that it's a much better compromise, a much better disposition of the matter, to delay this section as well, because I can't see otherwise than that the passing of it would have the effect that's been mentioned by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8 (a) passed, as amended.

MR. MOLGAT:in view of the fact that there has been correspondence on this subject from the Superintendent of Insurance who after all is the man responsible from the government standpoint, for the -- at least the administration within the department. Now admittedly, the letter that was mentioned was a personal letter, but certainly parts of it were read before the Committee. There was no record obviously in the Committee, because no Hansard operates there. I wonder if the government would not be prepared to supply the House with at least the portion of the letter that was read before the Committee. I think it would be preferable if the whole letter could be tabled, and possibly the approval of the two gentlemen concerned could be obtained in this regard. I would think that the Superintendent of Insurance and Mr. Newman would probably be prepared to supply this information to the House due to the fact that they have been in correspondence on this very subject. But, if for some reason or other, it was impossible to get the whole of the correspondence, then why not supply to the House at least that portion of the correspondence that was read before the Committee? Because my understanding is, from that correspondence, that the Superintendent of Insurance indicates that the legislation that is before us now is not necessary. And if that is so, then I think that the House should be apprised of the views of the Superintendent of Insurance if he was prepared to give them to someone else; and if this other person was prepared to read them before a Committee of this House, then I think the House itself should get the information. And I would ask the Minister if he would not be prepared to table that correspondence, if not the whole thing, then at least the portion that was read in the Committee.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think my recollection of the letter is not that the letter - the letter didn't make any comment about the legislation being unnecessary. I don't think the letter made any reference whatsoever to legislation. I think the letter was to the general effect that the custom and the practice was in fact as contended for by Mr. Newman, but that was only the expression of an opinion and the members of the Law Amendments Committee had heard at least one other counsel - well really two other counsel - express a contrary opinion as to what they thought the law was. So that I think that's the general purport of the correspondence. I don't think that the Superintendent of Insurance's letter made any reference whatever to the legislation being necessary or unnecessary.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to convey that he referred directly to this legislation but what he pointed out was the same thing that we've been pointing out here, that from his experience he realized that this type of an action just was not likely to occur again. And while we didn't hear the whole letter read, certainly my interpretation of it, was that it followed as night follows day, from that, that it was his opinion that such legislation was unnecessary. And I'd like to see exactly what that letter did say.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if it isn't the intention of the government to proclaim this legislation until a later date, I think myself that they would be rendering a greater service to those innocent people who might perhaps be injured or affected if the law is, as was stated by Mr. Charlie Huband, if these people were advised to protect themselves in the meantime by placing their own insurance; that would give them the protection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8 (a), as amended, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Will the Minister be prepared to table the correspondence that was read before the Law Amendments Committee?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most unwise to become involved in that. The members were before the Committee, were in the Committee, heard what was read by Mr. Newman in his presentation and I would be of the opinion that it would not be wise.

Mr. Chairman, if it will help any and without prejudice in any way, if members would wish to hold this bill in this Committee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that he thinks it would be unwise to table the correspondence. Surely if correspondence is read before the Law Amendments Committee where there is no record, because there is no equipment there to record what goes on in the Committee, surely members of the House - and not all of them are members of Law Amendments Committee - should be entitled to get what was said. And in this particular case we're not asking for all of the correspondence. If there's some reason that not all of it can be given, fine, then at least the portion that was read before the Committee itself. Surely those members who are not members of Law Amendments, should be entitled to have that information.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, as a matter of clarification, if I remember rightly, wasn't that a letter that was just a personal letter that had been written to

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd).....Mr. Newman and he didn't want to table the letter at the Committee stage? And apologized for reading the letter to the Committee?

MR. McLEAN:a personal letter. I.....

MR. MOLGAT:but he read it before the Committee and there are a number of members of this House who are not members of the Committee. Now surely, they're entitled to have at least that portion public. If all of it can't be tabled, fine, it's a personal letter, but the portion that was read before the Committee, surely becomes public information when that is done. There are members of this House who were not at the Committee, who are not members of the Committee, who did not have the information and surely the least that they can have is that portion that was read there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the correspondence that was tabled by the Minister of Municipal Affairs today, dealing with the CPR question, that one of the letters tabled was a personal letter, so I think we have a good precedent.....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that he's going to delay the proclamation of the bill. Is he prepared to give the House assurance that the bill will not receive proclamation until the case has been heard and the judgment delivered?

MR. McLEAN: No, Mr. Chairman, there was some suggestion in the Law Amendments Committee that the insurance industry -- and I refer particularly to the position occupied by Mr. Huband who appeared as counsel for the All-Canada Insurance Federate, or whatever it is called -- some indication that they might be prepared to sit down with the Superintendent of Insurance and work out perhaps some standard form of mortgage clause that would make it clear beyond all possible doubt as to the rights of mortgage holders and of insured persons. And Mr. Chairman, it is possible that if that were accomplished, if that were accomplished, that it would not be necessary to proclaim this insurance because it might be considered that they would prefer to do this on a voluntary basis and in a manner of that sort. If after a suitable time this could not be done then I would presume that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council might consider proclaiming the legislation and I would not think that the proclamation or otherwise would be dependent upon the result of the case that was referred to, since that has obviously been excluded insofar as this legislation is concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thought I understood the Minister to say that he was prepared to hold the bill in this Committee and this certainly would be agreeable to us at this stage, if he can supply us with more information. Is he prepared then to move, as he suggested a moment ago, that the bill be held here in Committee?

MR. McLEAN: I am advised that I can't do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 8 (a) passed, as amended.

The remainder of Bill No. 119 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 120, Section 1 (a) passed, (b) --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, what is the definition of a municipality, a town and a city, under The Shops Regulations Act. Are they the same as under any other Act? Or who should I direct this question to?--(Interjection)--The member for East Kildonan, Mr. Chairman. The question was, Mr. Chairman, what is the definition of a municipality, a city and a town, under The Shops Regulation Act?

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): I will refer that to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): So far as I am aware, Mr. Chairman, a municipality under The Shops Regulation Act has the same meaning as it has in The Municipal Act and it refers to them all.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, may I ask for clarification and will this include the City of Winnipeg, Portage, Brandon, Flin Flon, any other city or town?

MR. SMELLIE: I believe that's correct, Mr. Chairman. The Shops Regulation Act has always applied to the whole of the province; that is the whole of the province that is organized. It only refers to those parts where there is an organized municipality.

MR. CHAIRMAN:(b) passed, (c) passed, 1 passed, 2 passed, preamble - -

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs made a statement there that I'm not too clear on. He said this applies only to unorganized municipalities. Is that correct?

MR. SMELLIE: I said this applies to the areas of the province that are organized into

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) . . . municipalities. It would have absolutely no meaning up along the east side of the lakes where there are no municipalities and where there is no organization that could bring in such a by-law.

The remainder of Bill 120 was read and passed.

Bills Nos. 121, 122, 123 and 127 were read section by section and passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Committee rises, if I could ask a question of the First Minister. Could he indicate to the House at this time, if there is any further government legislation to come forward?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I think, Mr. Chairman, that all the legislation that the government intends to produce has been given first reading, yes -- or it appears yes, it has been given first reading, with the exception of those three or four bills that usually follow the conclusion of the budget debate.

MR. MOLGAT: the bills.

MR. ROBLIN: Those are the routine bills, yes. There are some amendments that we're making to the financial legislation that will come in then but I don't really expect they'll cause much controversy but as for the other bills, the other work of our session, I believe I am correct in stating that they are all in. Now there just may be one or two odds and ends that aren't; I can check that, but I think they're all in now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills Nos. 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123 and 127 and has adopted all of these bills without amendment.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bill No. 116 was read a third time and passed.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 119, an Act to amend The Mortgage Act for third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

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

Bills Nos. 120, 121, 122, 123 and 127 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 132. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, during debate because I had not given study and perusal to the bill and also to the correspondence that was placed on our desks, I have since done that and I have no quarrel actually with the legislation. I at least would support second reading, so that we could have representation made in committee and hear the parties concerned. I know that on a previous occasion we had legislation brought forward by one of the parties and I think it was refused at that time and I would like to hear from those in committee.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed reading of Bill No. 110. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask for this order to stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak on it at this time of course I'd be quite agreeable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak?

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 126, an Act to amend certain provisions of The Statute Law and to correct certain typographical errors in the Statutes, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, just a word. This is a bill which comes at every session, and in which I think each time the Attorney-General says there's no principle involved in this bill. There are correction of clerical errors, correction of typographical errors; one particular matter last year, in the definition of the judicial districts a typing error was made and this has now been all corrected and included here. There are some references to The Municipal Act in relation to The Liquor Control Act and a matter pertaining to The Law

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... Society Act which ties in with the change in judicial districts, a change in the fiscal year of the Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation. One matter which is of particular interest to me, and it's a beginning of something that I have been interested in, and that is the changing of the designation "police magistrate" to simply "magistrate" in The Magistrates' Act. I have made reference to this on a number of previous occasions and we are proposing these changes insofar as The Magistrates' Act is concerned. I really haven't had an opportunity of checking whether similar alterations are required in other statutes, but in any event we are making a beginning in this bill at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his explanation and I note that on three of the Sections here - 7, 8 and 9 - it refers to amendments insofar as qualifications of voters on The Liquor Control Act. Is there any change in the qualifications of voters, or is this merely to tie in two statutes? I unfortunately have not had the chance to check this against the original statutes. I just want the assurance that there's no change in qualifications and that it's simply a matter of arranging statutes.

MR. McLEAN: No, no change in qualifications. It's a technical amendment only.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare that 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 for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): I can provide the answer to several of the questions which were raised before the Committee rose this afternoon. The question was raised as to what is the smallest welfare cheque. Generally speaking, the smallest amount that is issued is \$2.00. If there was a cheque issued for a lesser amount it may have been just a carry-over from some shortage in a previous cheque.

The Member for Brokenhead raised some questions around the use of the Vaughan Street Detention Home by the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and I've received information to the effect that they are only left there if they are waiting for a charge to be made in Juvenile Court or if the individuals happen to be vagrants who are being held before being returned to their homes, either in this province or some other jurisdiction, or possibly being held waiting a transfer to the Children's Aid Society or something of that effect. But generally speaking, they are being held there for some action of the courts rather than as a receiving home for the Children's Aid Society.

I've also been advised that the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg does have a receiving home which is serving their needs in the Winnipeg area at the present time.

The Member for Assiniboia raised some questions around the problems of adoption in his particular area. We know that approximately a year ago, the waiting period averaged something like 18 months. That has been cut down to the present time to an average of about six months. Now some of them may go somewhat longer than that but others will be handled in a shorter period of time. Last year we placed two additional workers in the Central Interlake area that have responsibility only for child welfare and of course we had the crash program last summer involving the students between first and second year at the School of Social Work which did result in the doubling of adoption placements in the Central Interlake region. We're going to continue to work in this area and we hope of course to be able to reduce waiting periods. However, this depends on the staff that we have available for this kind of work.

The Member for Gladstone was rather interested in what was taking place in his own constituency. I'm somewhat surprised that he doesn't know. I suspect maybe he does. I understand there have been at least three meetings this year between members of our staff and the local people interested in elderly persons' housing. One of the bills which has just received third reading in the House here was presented to solve a particular problem that arose in the Neepawa area where a number of municipalities were joining together to sponsor an elderly persons' housing project. The passage of this Act will facilitate this particular program.

We understand that there have been six sites that have been studied as possible locations for a hostel or accommodation hostel, personal care home. I understand that a selection has

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). not yet been made.

Liaison has been maintained with the Manitoba Hospital Commission with respect to the need for hospital beds in the area and they are certainly aware of the discussions that have been taking place around the elderly persons' housing project for that area. The survey has been made by staff of the Local Health Unit and Care Services to try to assess the need for either a hostel or personal care home in that particular area. At the present time we have not received a formal application from them.

Now since 1958 I think the Committee would be interested to know that we've had 48 new elderly persons' housing projects and these have made accommodation available for 2,364 persons. It's involved expenditures totalling \$8 million and presently under construction, or presently having been approved by government, are another \$4 million worth of projects. So this is a total of some \$12 million in new capital facilities that have either been built or will be built in the near future and this does not take into account the furnishings that go into these projects. So I think we can see that there has been a very substantial increase in the amount of investment in alternate care facilities ranging from housing right through to personal care homes. In addition to that, over 600 elderly and infirm persons are presently in boarding homes or foster homes or in their own homes with special care services being laid on to meet their needs.

Quite a bit was said this afternoon about the shortage of hospital beds. The latest report of the Care Services Organization indicates that in the Metropolitan area, awaiting placement, there are two in the Winnipeg General Hospital, one in the Selkirk General Hospital, one in Misericordia, one in the Psychiatric Institute, three in the Rehab Hospital, 10 in the Municipal Hospitals, and 11 in the St. Boniface Sanatorium, making a total of 29 people awaiting placement by Care Services. That encompasses over half of the province and is certainly substantially different from the figures that were given this afternoon. As far as the rural parts of Manitoba, I'm afraid that I don't have the information on them at the present time. But the Committee will know that there have been very substantial investments in hospital facilities as indicated by the Minister of Health at various times.

There was one other question that was raised around what the government was doing with respect to people who require rehabilitation either for physical or some mental condition that they have, and I would like to say that these facilities are available, are being used by welfare services. I have one of the latest reports here of people receiving training under Schedule R. A very substantial number of them are people who have been referred to the training either by the Provincial Department of Welfare or by one of the municipal welfare departments. I think something like a third of those who are contained in these lists here, going to nine pages and involving I think some 60 people, have been referred by various welfare agencies and I think we're doing really a pretty good job in trying to rehabilitate people who do have problems. So that's really all I have to say and I think that answers most of the questions, Mr. Chairman, that were outstanding from this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: One question, Mr. Chairman, that I asked this afternoon, for which I have not received a reply. I'm sure that it's only because the Honourable the Minister got it mixed up with his other papers. The question was when is the rest of The Social Allowances Act going to be proclaimed?

MR. CARROLL: a pretty full answer to that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: It was a simple question. A simple answer was required. When?

MR. CARROLL: The answer was as soon as possible and I think I tried to point out some of the difficulties around the problems of social workers, trained staff, to be able to do the kind of work that should be done in this field, the kind of reorganization that's taking place within our department at the present time, the kind of co-operation we've got with the Minister of Education in trying to train people for career service in the department, through our technical institutes. All of these things dovetailing and working together will certainly bring along the day more quickly when the balance of this Act can be proclaimed.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on that point, the one particular clause that I was interested in, and so were other members, was the four-year clause insofar as desertion. Now I don't think the statement that the Minister just gave, insofar as social workers and the likes of that will have any material bearing on these particular cases because they're being looked after at the present time at the municipal level and so I can't see, in these cases at least, the problem that the Minister poses before the Committee. I appreciate as far as social workers are concerned it is a problem and I intend, when we get down to the item, to have

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . something to say on that but this isn't the answer so far as the four-year desertion problem.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I think one of the big problems that all social agencies are facing is the one parent family. If you study the matters, I think this is where a great many of our social problems emanate from and I would disagree with the Leader of the NDP to the extent that I think these are cases that do require a great deal of work and I would certainly be very reluctant to take them over unless we can do a proper job on them, certainly a better job than is being done, at least as good a job as is being done at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the Honourable Minister was, well he wasn't too happy when my colleague here tried to discuss some certain question of both departments combined together, Health and Welfare. I think he used a little bit of sarcasm at that time and he certainly wasn't happy. But I certainly would like to know how we can do this without doing this when we discuss certain things and I don't know if he purposely chose to misunderstand the questions of my honourable friend but when my honourable friend was talking about having some different type of hospital where you didn't need the acute care, I think that he was mentioning some of the hospitals now that are under my honourable friend's department. For instance, I can think of the Tache Hospital. I think that this comes, not under the Hospital Plan, it's something that I fail to understand, and not under the Minister of Agriculture, as my friend seemed to indicate that this was related, this afternoon. But this is the case, this is what we meant; more of these and that the administration should be different.

Now I have mentioned this for the last three or four years. For instance if you have a patient in an acute care hospital and this patient is being cared for by the Hospital Plan, well it only stands to reason that he is not too fussy, he's not inclined to moving and saying well, I don't need this kind of care, and I'll go somewhere else where I'll have to pay. Now this is what we were trying to say. Maybe there's enough of these hospitals but you can't start building from the top. I think it would be wrong if you start building beds for acute care. I think that we have to see some of these people in those hospitals -- I think it's safe to say shouldn't be there -- they should be in another hospital that it would be less costly but because of the administration, because of the present setup, they won't move. They are told sometimes by their own doctor - you're crazy if you move, you'll have to pay yourself, and I think this is only natural, you're dealing with human beings and they're not crazy about this and they figure, well why should I do this, I'll have to work more, I'm not going to get as much care and I'll have to pay.

This is what I meant that when we were talking about beds, we have to take care of everything. We know -- the department says, well we're not interested in keeping them in beds. I don't think that he can seriously think that we are. We'd like to see them out of bed also, but those people that are there; they are some of the people that it's because of age. Now if they are in one of these hospitals, acute care hospitals, they will never leave unless they are forced to leave and then that creates a problem - that creates a problem; their doctors will, dealing with human nature also, will try to favour his patient as much as possible and that's what he should do. He'll give him the benefit of the doubt and I'm positive if there was a way, that at a certain time this would -- the Hospital Plan would still take care of these patients they would get out of them. Now you're not saving anything, when you say, well we're not responsible for this, because you are keeping too many people in hospitals that are too costly for their need. There is no necessity for that and instead of paying a smaller amount, the Hospital Plan has to pay more and this is something - I know that this cannot be done, we have to be reasonable. These are problems that cannot be solved from one day to the other and we appreciate this, but this is why we mention it every year. But I resent the fact that the Minister should make jokes about this, and try to misrepresent my honourable colleague's intention. I'm sure that he understood what was meant.

Now I think that he should agree with us that this is a problem and it's something that should be rectified and that we should try and work together to try to arrive at a solution, not just say, well maybe, but there's nothing we can do. There is no doubt, I think that he'll have to agree with me and if he doesn't, I'd like him to say so now; that we could save money, the people would be better satisfied and we would also save the building of these hospitals, more beds that are not needed now.

I know that the Minister cannot solve this from one day to the other but I'd like to get serious - I'm sure he's concerned on this -- his feelings and his ideas on that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the same subject matter, I was rather surprised to have my honourable friend the Minister adopt the attitude that he did prior to us adjourning at 5:30 because over a year ago, on April 12th, 1964, to be exact, a propaganda sheet emanating from his department explained, or attempted to explain a complete new bill in respect, in respect to this alternative care housing. Surely my honourable friend hasn't read it. I question now whether or not the Ministers of the various departments check the propaganda sheets before they're made public, because this one as I say, dated April 17th, 1964, says "Welfare Minister Honourable J. B. Carroll said that the government move into the new field of assisting to provide accommodation for those who require 'continual and intensive assistance and supervision in their daily living' would partially close the gap between services provided through elderly persons' housing units and hostels on the one hand, and that provided by extended treatment hospitals on the other."

And the whole two page article goes on to explain in some detail the provisions of a new bill that apparently the Minister intended to bring in a year ago. The whole program is outlined here. It goes on to say at the last paragraph, "While elderly persons' housing is limited to those persons 65 or over, the new personal care homes will be permitted to accept people under this age where, in the opinion of a qualified doctor, this type of care is required." Surely my honourable friend knows of the new proposals outlined in this propaganda sheet.

Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of passing interest, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who was sitting over in what we call the "graveyard section" of the Assembly today, happens to be a cousin of mine and I asked him, since their Session is over now, what procedure they follow there on the estimates. He says, well we always have the Deputy Minister and/or his assistant come in and sit beside the Minister. Now I know that their House is not semi-circular like ours is, but I think that this is a real good idea rather than this mocassin teletype program that goes on in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... that up at the special committee meeting when we study the rules.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Okay, thank you. I hope that they pay some attention to it. Now I'm still waiting a couple of answers. Mr. Chairman what committee was that that you suggested?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The special committee set up by the Legislature.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A special committee on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On rules.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Rules and Orders and Regulations. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you. I'm still awaiting some particulars on the closing of the Assiniboine Hospital or alternative care home in Brandon. I know that presently it seems to me there is a bit of a wrangle going on between the Sanatorium Board, the Province and the Brandon General Hospital in this whole field, and I know that certain employees, certain employees, are concerned naturally about the future of their jobs. Why wouldn't they be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's under the Department of Health. Would you please stick to the Department of Welfare.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, this province joined Confederation about 1870 ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're speaking about the Department of Welfare, estimates of the Department of Welfare. Will the honourable gentleman please keep to the estimates.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Department of Welfare. Well what I am trying to do is that up to about four years ago they were all under one Minister, both Health and Welfare were under one Minister, up till about four years ago, and they are so co-related

MR. CHAIRMAN: They are not now. Now, please keep to the estimates.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well it's pretty difficult and you will have to keep reminding me, because I rather thought that health had to do with the welfare of the people but apparently it hasn't any more. But if my honourable friend doesn't intend to comment on the Assiniboine Hospital in Brandon, well then I will just have to refer it to the Minister of Agriculture or someone else.

Can I ask him this question, Mr. Chairman? Can a person apply now for a permit to build a private nursing home or alter an existing one or change the capacity of an existing one or anything of that nature? Can he -- I know that certain nursing homes are presently registered, because I have before me a list of all those that are registered. Is there any use of a person presently applying for the construction of a nursing home, or the alteration of an existing one? Surely that comes under Welfare.

And I think the Honourable Member for St. John's raised a very very important question that has not been answered to my satisfaction. I don't know whether it has to his or not.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) He says no it hasn't Mr. Chairman, and it certainly concerns the welfare of the people too, very much so and that is this -- that when the social workers go out, and he talked about all that you needed was to be good in arithmetic to figure out the amount of social allowance that was coming to you, because you just subtracted the income from the outgo and that determined the amount of social allowance that you were entitled to, and if, if, it so worked out that you needed \$2.01 you would not only get the \$2.01 but you would get a medicare card that was worth about \$200 because you can't buy it -- that is, an individual like you and I cannot buy that kind of coverage and this is my point. It is a wonderful program, this medicare card, but if there's only a dollar stopping you -- this is the point that the Honourable Member for St. John's raises -- surely to goodness that a one dollar bill shouldn't separate the people from receiving this \$200 benefit or whatever it's worth.

And then there's another area, the same principle involved, and Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether you have assisted people to make out an application for premium exemption or medicare or social allowance, but I have. I've assisted them, and I have said to them point blank, "Listen, if you're a single person and you've got more than \$500 there is no point of me proceeding any further with this application. If you're a married person and you have more than \$1,000 there is no point of wasting your time and my time because you're not going to get any social allowance." What we are inclined to tell them if they've got \$502.00 is, for heaven's sakes go out and spend the \$2.00 and then you'll qualify, or if you're married person and you've got \$1,100 in the bank, well surely there is something you need in your home to the tune of \$100 - go and buy it; why deprive yourself of some of the real necessities of life because what you are doing is disqualifying yourself from social allowance and medicare. And I would like to have my honourable friend explain or justify his position in this regard.

So Mr. Chairman, I'm always afraid that I may get off onto Health here and that does not concern the welfare of the people, so I will wait now for an answer from my honourable friend. I need some welfare.

MR. CARROLL: The answer to the question about can anybody apply for a nursing home licence I would say the answer is yes, anyone can apply. There seems to be some doubt as to what we mean by a person's needs and I think maybe I could best illustrate that by indicating what a person would get -- a single unemployable adult with no pension, living in a rented room in Winnipeg as compared to Regina, Edmonton, Vancouver. A person living in Winnipeg would get \$84; in Regina 72; Edmonton 84; Vancouver 66. A single unemployable adult living with relatives, and this means with close relatives, without special care in Manitoba, he'd get \$55; in Regina he'd get the same \$72, it doesn't matter whether he's living in a heated room, separate and apart by himself, or whether he's living with relatives, he is going to get the same amount. We say that isn't right, that the costs should be different and we've scaled our grants down, so he gets only \$55 in Manitoba for his allowance plus his special needs. The same thing with a person living with relatives requiring special care, he has special needs so he gets \$85 in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan he gets the same \$72; it doesn't matter whether he has special needs or not, he still gets the same amount of grant. The single unemployable adult, without special care, would get \$72 in Manitoba, the same as Saskatchewan. And the single adult, with non-relatives, with special care, would get \$102 in Manitoba because his needs are that much greater, but in Saskatchewan he would get the same \$72. In other words, we've tried to scale our grants, or tailor our grants, to the actual needs of the individual and we've tried to follow this principle right down the line, with respect to boarding, care - with respect to all of the other needs of the individual. We've tried to tailor them on an individual basis, to the individual's needs. And I think this is something that maybe some other provinces, less well advanced in the philosophy of meeting need, probably haven't figured out up to the present time. I just mention this because this is related to the question that the Member for St. John's was having some difficulty with this afternoon.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much hearing from the enlightened Minister of an enlightened government in an enlightened province, of how they operate. But I now realize that what he was telling us, was how they arrive at the need. But it seems to me that what I was asking about, was what is the means test that is used? And I always thought that there was a needs test that somebody talked about, in this House; it turns out that it's really a means test because I gave the Minister a formula. He didn't give me one, but I gave him one. And that formula has not yet been challenged; and according to that formula - and I'll take the liberty of repeating it because I know that I was getting awfully close to the 5:30 hour and possible the Minister was so nervous I wouldn't get finished that he didn't

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . quite hear it. I'll repeat it just to make sure that we understand it, he and I. A person living with a close relative is considered to be paying \$45 a month board and room. Now that has nothing whatsoever to do with what that person needs to eat in terms of diet or anything else or whether that person shares a room or occupies two rooms, or whatever it is - \$45 board and room. And then there's \$5 for clothing; regardless of whether that person stays in bed all day or goes to teas all day, \$5 a month is the clothing allowance. Five dollars is for personal needs. Five dollars I described as leeway, and since I wrote it down I assume that that may be the description of the classification given to me by the case worker, but in any event, it came to \$60.00. And then the point I made was that I was informed that if the drug bill was under \$15, therefore this person was assumed to be able to manage on less than \$75 and was not entitled to a medicare card. If the drug bill was \$16, and therefore the person had an allocation here of \$76 and only received a \$75 pension, then that difference of \$1.00 in excess of 75, or in excess of 15 for drugs, entitled the applicant to a medicare card. And the honourable member on my right referred to a medicare card being worth \$200 a month - maybe it is -- (interjection) -- a year. Well I'm certain it is, because a medicare card entitles this person to medical attention with a doctor of this person's choice rather than having to stand in line at an out-patients department. It entitles the person to prescribed drugs; it entitles the person to, I think, optical need; it entitles a person to dentures; and I don't want to embark on a lecture on dentures. I'm sure it might be beneficial to the House at this stage, but we'll hold back on that, just to tell you that dentures are a fairly substantial cost item. All these things are things to which a medicare card-holder becomes entitled and the method in which the calculation is arrived at, I think, has nothing to do with need. It apparently has to do with means. Because the difference of one dollar in a monthly drug bill opens the door wide and this just doesn't seem to make sense.

The example I gave was a real one; it wasn't a figment of my imagination. I discovered from the druggist that looked after this woman, that because he was sympathetic to her needs, he was charging her his cost. She was using a lot of drugs. And that meant that her bill was less than 15 a month and therefore she could not get her other needs, her medical needs, her other entitlements out of medicare looked after. But when I pointed out to him that he was not doing her a favour by giving her a reduced charge and that the favour would be if he charged her the proper fee, then she became entitled to the medicare card. Now when I pointed that out, the Honourable Minister rose and said, "See, that's looking after her needs." Well that's a pretty pretty broad definition of needs, if one dollar difference in a budget opens or closes the door to a medicare card.

Now I'd like some clarification on just whether or not there is this hard and fast formula, which is not related in my opinion to general needs, but is related to the drug bill. That's all it seems to be. It seems to be related to the cost of drugs to this person. And the difference is, I think, very very great. The difference is all that a person is entitled to get with a medicare card, which is much more than going to an out-patients department and not having a doctor of this patient's choice, and all the other involvements. This person who now has a medicare card, has her drug bill paid for - that \$15 - and now instead of having \$5 in what they call leeway, she has \$20 for what they call leeway. And she is therefore -- (interjection) -- She has not? Well then the Minister will have to explain this to me because that's my understanding. So I'll sit down and give the Minister an opportunity to explain it. The reason I am not going to dwell further is that I am now convinced that the Minister is not going to explain his attitude to the discrepancy between welfare payments being made to recipients as between various municipalities in Greater Winnipeg and there's no use dealing with that any further. So I'll stay with this medicare card and see what answer I get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . 2 -- passed, 1 (a) -- passed; (b) 1 -- passed; 2 -- passed; 3 -- passed; 4 -- passed; (c) 1 -- passed. Resolution 101 passed. Resolution 102, 2(a) -- passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, Item 2 is welfare. Does medicare come under welfare? -- (Interjection) -- Well then I wonder if I might pretend that I have just spoken on this question of medicare card and invite the Minister to answer the question which I raised.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think that there are bound to be a great many borderline cases. I think we try to assess the person's -- if he's living alone we assess his needs according to a scale of grants which is outlined in the regulations and which every member of this House should have, or if they haven't got, can be supplied by merely dropping around at our office at any time. And if in assessing their needs, which does include drugs, if a person

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . is consistently in need of drugs, if their needs -- adding up all their bills including drugs and doctors' bills -- go beyond their resources, then they become entitled to a medicare card and possibly even a cash supplement if they so require, and this we think is the way in which we can meet the needs. Now in this particular case, we have an unusual situation of a person who is fortunate enough to be living with relatives and thereby having a very low cost of living because they share many things as a family unit and this is one of the reasons why the cost of board and room is scaled down for people living with close relatives. We feel that they are part of the home atmosphere and the home environment and thereby do much more sharing than would be the case if they were hiring board and room. And we have the unusual situation of a person that has some chronic ailment no doubt that requires consistently very high drug bills.

Now I don't know whether the honourable member would say that we should pay her drug bill and let this woman fend for herself with respect to her other medical needs, her dentures and eyeglasses, and everything else. We thought this was a program that met the needs of that individual. It does in this case given them a little more leeway than perhaps some other person might get. But after all, no matter where we draw that line, there are going to be borderline cases and this just happens to be one that weighs in favour of the recipient. There may be many others who are turned down for medicare because they're within the one dollar, but not quite, of being in a position of receiving this kind of assistance free of charge. I think our medicare program is operating satisfactorily. I think it's appreciated by the old people in the Province of Manitoba who get it, who enjoy it, who write us letters telling us how much they appreciate this service. I regret that the Member for St. John's is not in favour of the program or doesn't appear to be. He seems to feel that this particular woman should not be getting a medicare card. I really must confess that it's one of many borderline cases and I think that we're doing the right thing by providing her a card in this particular case.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister has now attempted -- well he hasn't attempted, he has come right out and put words in my mouth, to suggest that I am opposed to medicare. I think he heard me, I think it was just a forensic tact on his part to try and distract me from what I was telling him and I think he began to realize just what the situation really is. And that is that I was really talking about the person who got one dollar less, who spent one dollar less in drugs, than the \$15 and that person is the one who is losing all the benefits of medicare. And if the Minister needs to have it spelled out, then I will assure him that I am in favour of medicare being provided to all people in this province on a contributory basis with government participation, right across the line. Now he may not have realized that, but I'm telling him that so that he can rest assured that I have not changed my attitude from this side of the House.

Well now, he told us something and that was that when the department assesses whether or not a person goes on medicare, they look at that person's needs and costs -- the doctor bills -- I think that's what the Honourable Minister said. He's not nodding his head but I still say he said the doctor bills, the medical bills, and that's incorrect because the medical bills are not assessed in this calculation at all, because the department apparently takes the attitude that there need not be any medical bills because the applicant has the opportunity of getting free medical attention by going to the out-patients department in the hospital and therefore in this case that I'm speaking of, this applicant who had substantial medical bills, had to find the resources for payment of them outside of the pension cheque and outside of the allotment of the department. But the minute the drugs went over that's when, as I say, this door was opened.

So the Minister better get clear in his mind whether or not his department is prepared to provide medicare cards to look after those who are in need of medical assistance, doctors' visits and I'm suggesting to him that the doctor's visit only comes when a medicare card is available and not without a medicare card and I am therefore really speaking on behalf of that person who, according to this calculation only spends \$74.00 a month exclusive of dentures, optical requirements and medical costs. That's the person that I'm speaking for and that's the person that it seems to me is left out because of this peculiar formula which the department has and of which I have apparently made the Minister aware and which maybe he was not familiar with until I brought it up.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have some information from the Minister. Just what do these medicare cards - the servicing of them cost as an average for the number of people that we have in the province. I think this would be interesting for the committee

(MR. FROESE cont'd) members to know, because in this way we

MR. CARROLL: There are a number of factors. Its 281 for doctors; 581 is the total cost broken down into 281 for the doctors -- I can get you the figures here for dental, optical, etc., if you care to just hold on a moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, what we would like to know is, how many medicare cards are out in the province and what was the total cost paid to MMS for them. I think this would satisfy us. The number of total cards that are out in the province and the total premium paid by the province to MMS for the coverage. And incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know too, is my honourable friend the Minister going to table the new regulations or the new schedule of payments that he read from just a few moments ago. He suggested that every member of the House could have one if he wanted one. Well, I for one would like one and I think all members of this side of the House would like to have one and compare it with the regulations that we last received on or about February five years ago.

MR. CARROLL: I would like to point out that there was an Order for Return filed this year which did give the information with respect to the number of cards that were out. It did not ask the information which we had hoped that they would ask, which was the number of people that were covered by those cards. I can give you that information in just a moment. Twenty-four thousand, three hundred and ten as at December, 1964: the total number of people covered during that month by medicare coverage.

The other question was how much paid to ?

MR. SHOEMAKER: The government paid to MMS for the coverage.

MR. CARROLL: Two dollars and eighty-one cents per card holder.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Two dollars and eighty-one cents times 24 thousand, some odd per month.

MR. CARROLL: Right. Per month.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Per month?

MR. CARROLL: Right. Information up to March 31st, 1964, with respect to dental costs, \$151,082.00; drugs, \$565,531.00; optical, \$76,077.00.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, point because I, for two of us in our family I pay about \$150.00 annually, annually for about half of the coverage that is offered under a medicare card. I wonder if my honourable friend could explain the discrepancy here, because it seems to me that here is a pretty good point for all of Manitobans to have comprehensive health care if we can get it for \$2.81.

MR. CARROLL: Well you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that this was a special deal that was made with the Manitoba Medical Association under which they provided their services at a somewhat reduced schedule of fees, in fact there was a 50 percent proration initially. There have been some negotiations taking place lately; they have not been concluded at the present time but they have been asking for a higher proration of medical fees with respect to the premiums that are paid.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose my honourable friend would have this information readily available but

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has the floor.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, when one looks at the whole field of welfare services, one cannot help but be impressed by the magnitude of the job and the amount of heartbreak at times, I suppose that one get in this department and I think that generally speaking, with the calibre of social workers that we're getting in the field today and I believe my leader already mentioned that, that we are beginning to see the light but there are a few things that keep bothering me and I find this is the occasion every year to keep reminding the Minister.

One of the things as I see it Mr. Chairman, that bothers me, is the care of people who are living with their sons and daughters, people whose sole income is \$75.00 per month. Now the Minister said a little while ago that the idea today is to keep old people in their homes, keep them from getting into these other institutions. Well, I want to submit for the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that we're not doing that, by our treatment of these people. For instance, I keep reminding this House every year about a certain person who is over 80 years of age, whose sole income is \$75.00 per month. Out of this \$75.00 this person pays nearly \$4.00 into MMS and yet her requirements are for drugs. These drugs have been averaging \$20.00 per month so that means that this person is living on \$55.00 per month, because

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) . . . the protection that she's supposed to receive by this wonderful medical system we have denies her the use of drugs. Not only that but she requires continual care with spectacles and she has had considerable trouble with dentures and this sort of thing. Now, because she is living with relatives who are very kind to her, I believe that these young people are being prejudiced. It was different in the old days, Mr. Chairman, in the days of the old homestead where one more person didn't make very much difference. But in this day and age when you buy a home at probably at least \$15,000 and when you have to consider buying a home with an extra room it does make a difference, and I think that while the social workers go out and they assess the needs of the person, I think that we are being very unfair to many many of our young people, young married people.

Not only that Mr. Chairman, but remember that these young couples who are struggling along, raising a family and buying a home too, are being assessed with new taxes, taxes that really hit the people at the bottom of the scale. I would suggest that the least we could do for people who are living solely on \$75.00 and at this extreme age, is to guarantee them some sort of medical care. Is this too much to ask? Because this lady is denied a medicare card. This seems to me very unfair.

I have always been dismayed too by the lack of uniformity in our relief schedule and while it may be argued that the local officials know best, and I believe that they are capable, but I think that there are certain basic standards, especially in nutrition, that should be met and I would like to see the government take the initiative and at least insist on some minimum standard across the province. I think this is the least we can do.

I would like to ask the Minister about a new project in which I am very interested. It's called "Meals on Wheels". I don't know just to what extent the government contributes but I think it's a wonderful thing. It's only on a trial basis I believe at the present time but it does point out what is attempted to be done today.

Now there are many aspects of welfare, Mr. Chairman. As I said before, we see much unhappiness. We have now tied physical training and recreation under the Department of Welfare and I notice in the appropriations money is allocated for such things as judo and weight-lifting, and this is all good, because it does give some outlet for the energy of youth. But I would like to think that the idea of Chief Taft is a good one where he recommends a youth squad to help to combat juvenile delinquency. I know that it calls for special training with a special type of person but I think that we would be well advised to spend some of this money. Physical fitness is fine but I think that we can't afford to neglect juvenile delinquency and I could see not real opposition from the taxpayer toward money expended in this sort of thing. It seems that the family unit now is not the compact tight unit it used to be in the old days, with the automobile and a different way of life and I think that we're going to have to consider people who can go out among our young people, people who are able to give them advice and people whom they will respect by virtue of the special training that they will get. Because after all I believe that youth is simply craving recognition the same as the rest of us and if they can't get it one way they'll get it by getting on a motorcycle with a black jacket or getting into a gang or some other way and I think that we have to -- I think we have to adopt the policy of the Salvation Army, Mr. Chairman. We have to go out and meet it where we find it, and meet it with tolerance and understanding and I would make a special plea that the Department of Welfare consider getting into this field of juvenile delinquency and spending money along the lines of the physical fitness program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) -- passed --

MR. CARROLL: I think possibly I should just comment very briefly on the constructive remarks of the Member for Seven Oaks. I believe he might well follow the line that was taken by his colleague who is sitting with him at this time because if this person that he's referring to has consistently high drug costs, as he has suggested, at \$20 a month, she might well be considered as a prospect for a medicare card. This of course, would have to be considered in the light of all of the circumstances. She may have other income besides her pension or whatever, but I think that that might well be followed through.

With respect to "Meals on Wheels," I don't know whether the government is at the present time making grants to this organization. I know that there were discussions at one time with the Department of Health around this particular program. I think it's being sponsored by the Hospital Services, the Rehab Hospital, Manitoba, I believe it is. I saw an article on it a few days ago. I clipped it and put it in my folder here and it indicates that 60 percent of the cost will be borne by the referral agency. In other words, if the Department of Welfare

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . refer, mothers allowance or elderly people to this service, presumably we would be paying 60 percent of the cost of the service, 30 percent would be a subsidy paid by grants to the service through various organizations, maybe even the United Fund, 10 percent would be borne by the recipients themselves. This is really all I know about the present program as its underway.

I commend him for his very constructive views on the utilization of youth in our province. I think our Gimli training course has been a step in this direction, a program under which 125 boys and 125 girls can receive training in recreation programs. Quite a few of these go back home and put this training to use within their own home communities or in their schools. We think it's a constructive program; we are utilizing this idea with respect to the first year graduates of our course of physical education this year with respect to the summer leadership program with our municipalities.

MR. PAULLEY: In the field of welfare services I wish to raise a point dealing with our social workers. The Minister in one or two of the replies that he made, indicated that there is a severe shortage of social workers at the present time and I'm sure that we all appreciate that at the university level more and more men and women are entering into the faculty of social work and obtaining their degree. I want to say Mr. Chairman that I disagree entirely with the comment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa when he talks about the social worker, because if I heard him correctly the honourable member suggested that social workers do not need to be trained. He referred -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I suggested that inasmuch as there was an apparent drastic shortage of social workers that perhaps we could introduce into this field certain individuals with limited qualifications, and I read an article that came from my honourable friend's department recommending exactly this.

MR. PAULLEY: I thank the Honourable Member for that explanation but it seemed to me in listening to him that there was some suggestion that in the field of social work people with a limited amount of training could fulfil the job and personally Mr. Chairman I don't care whether it came from the Honourable Member for Gladstone or any other, I dispute this most vigorously. The honourable member when he was speaking, and I'm not trying to defend the government when I say this, I'm trying to point out the invaluable service that is being done and can be done by our social workers, because my concept of a social worker isn't, as someone suggested, merely going around with a document totalling the financial resources that they have and then arriving at whether or not the particular individual concerned is entitled to receive a social allowance. I'm sure that the social workers who have had the proper training do more than this, and I frankly confess Mr. Chairman that on one or two occasions I have had a little disappointment in some of the statements that some social workers have made to people with whom they deal. It has been drawn to my attention and I resent this, but on the whole, by and large, the trained social worker is the type of person that we need more and more of, because not only do they look into the financial resources but I know of many cases where they have given proper guidance and advice to the people with whom they come in contact.

After all, Mr. Chairman, and I make no apology for it so far as my own particular political party is concerned, that we have been asking for more and more social services and I'm sure that the honourable members will appreciate that over the years, a number of the proposals that we have suggested in this House have now been accepted and we only need to look at the total vote for this department of \$23 million to realize the necessity of having the staff, if at all possible, who are charged with the responsibility of investigation and giving advice, should be well trained and I think that we should show our appreciation to the social workers.

Now I understand Mr. Minister that the Manitoba Association of Social Workers have endeavoured to have legislation enacted which will give to them the status that is at present accorded to many other like agencies.

I have had one or two of the association come to see me in connection with this and ask me what I thought of the idea of them having legislation passed whereby the standards of the social worker would be recognized. I just want to refer to a document which I have before me from the association regarding their work in the Province of Manitoba and they say that following the close of World War II there was a marked expansion and development of welfare services. With this there is no argument. The question of who was to be employed to render these services became a pressing problem for the practitioners and the taxpayers alike. Against this background the Manitoba Association of Social Workers has been keenly interested in the question of regulating the profession through licensing in order to ensure the best possible service to clients.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) A number of study groups and general membership meetings have considered this important topic. In 1961 a workshop was sponsored by the Manitoba Association of Social Workers to discuss the nature and function of a professional organization and as a result of this conference, and of earlier concern of members, a committee was established to examine the possibility of becoming licensed.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this group in discussions with me assured me that there was no endeavour on their part to exclude those who at the present time are operating or engaged using the title 'social worker' for the time being. So a suggested bill was produced and my comments from the association would say this. "Briefly the bill would involve the setting up of an eleven member board of directors, consisting of four persons elected from the Institute, four persons appointed by the Minister of Welfare in the Province of Manitoba and three persons appointed by the Manitoba Association of Social Workers. The Institute would become a legal entity and provincial statute would define powers and areas of responsibility.

"The objects of the bill would be to assure in the public interest an adequate standard of performance of people practicing in the social welfare field through continuous examination, study and definition of this field of practice, through licensing and disciplining of those practitioners who are licensed under this Act and through undertaking such endeavours as may assist in determining and formulating appropriate training and licensing of those who are not licensed under this Act. Generally, membership in the Institute is open to all graduates of university schools of social work," and it was suggested then that there'd be a grandfather clause in any proposed legislation.

So while I understand that there has been some consultations with the Minister in regards to this, I would like the Minister if it is at all possible, for him to indicate whether the general premise of this will be acceptable to him and to his department and the government because it seems to me particularly in view of some of the discussions which have taken place during the consideration of the Honourable Minister's estimates, a sort of a connotation -- well, anybody can be a social worker and I don't think, I don't think, such is the case. Indeed I think the very opposite that our university has made provision for continuing studies past the Bachelor of Arts degree and into the field of social work; it does entail another two or three years as I understand it, of additional training for specific purposes. So I raise this question in a tribute to the social workers, that is the really trained social worker, and I also raise it in the knowledge that some representations have been made already to the Minister and I wonder if he could indicate to the committee the present situation in regard to any negotiation for legislation in this regard.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, it seems that every year we hear the same story that we haven't enough trained social workers and I know that most of these social workers are, the trained ones, are efficient but since we have so many social workers who are not well trained, then we may assume that they are not as efficient as the graduate social workers. Therefore if they're not as efficient, then this department is not functioning as economically as it possibly could. So if that is the case, we haven't enough trained social workers, I wonder why the department does not train more.

I would suggest that the department enlarge on its policy, because I know it is a policy, to send some of these under-graduate or under-trained social workers back to school on a bursary, or I understand that some of them are even sent back to school to graduate, on full salary. So if that is the case, if we are short of social workers, why don't we make more use of this? Then we will not be faced with the same problem every year, that we have not enough trained social workers. I think that we should try and procure these trained social workers.

The Minister is aware that in the past I was critical of some of the policies of this department and I thought that in many instances they were not efficient enough, not economical enough. Now I am not going to say that this year, I'm not going to criticize. But I was kind of interested in the remark that was made by the Honourable Member for Swan River in this department, as far as welfare is concerned. And I hope that isn't the typical thinking of the government, as far as economy goes.

The Honourable Member for Swan River suggested that welfare recipients should not be permitted to use cars as a means of transportation but rather they should go back to the old horse and buggy days -- back to the old one-horse shay as we called them. We all know that the one-horse shay is just a heap of ashes, something of the past. Surely the member should know that in our atomic age, to use a car is more economical -- a used car. I would like him to try and buy a horse now which would be of any service whatsoever and see if he wouldn't have to pay

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) at least \$300 for a serviceable animal. And what about the harness? About \$200 on top of that. Now for good measure, have to barn and have to pasture, the bedding and the feed, and on top of that, what about the buggy? I don't think the 1965 GMC buggies are out yet. And even if they were, to you'd have to pay at least \$500 for that buggy. Then the recipient, after investing about \$1500, he may be in business and he'll be able to say, "Get up Mollie, get up. Keep going." But by then, his assets would be so high that he may be disqualified as a welfare recipient. So he'll be the loser on that.

Now if the member still thinks that it is very economical, more economical, to use the horse and buggy, why not project it a little further and buy a little parasol and then take some of our pretty welfare girls - the pretty welfare workers - and sit them in this buggy and maybe let them do their daily rounds in a buggy, if it is more economical than a car. I am sure that this would create quite a sensation even here in our fair city of Metro. It might even prove to be a great tourist attraction. I would say, in my opinion, that the car at the present is more economical than any nag.

MR. CARROLL: I'd just like to say Mr. Chairman, that up our way all the welfare recipients drive dog teams. They've eliminated this problem altogether. Well with respect to welfare workers or the non-trained workers being inefficient, I think probably they're efficient enough in the kind of work they can do. The problem is that they're limited in the scope of work that they can undertake and they require a great deal more supervision than people who do have the proper training, and I think this is the main limitation of people who are engaged in the department in what we call a welfare, or a non-trained worker position. If the Member for Emerson would look down two or three items in the estimates he will see an item there: Social Work Bursaries. I think a large number of the trained staff that we have at the present time have taken advantage of the opportunity of bursaries over the years and have become fully qualified and are some of our best workers in the department. I think that we have no trouble of any kind to meet the quota with respect to people who are wanting to take advantage of these bursary opportunities and take further training. I think there is a very definite limitation at the School of Social Work because they require, in addition to the instruction facilities, they do require to do certain projects in the field and there are limitations here which have made it impossible to expand that School of Social Work to the extent that might have been desirable in the light of the growing need for these people.

I do think too that there is a great opportunity at the technical level, to work with people who are high school graduates and try to give them highly specialized training, both field work and classroom instruction. We have a course that's in the final stages now of being hammered out and we think that this will be a big help in meeting some of the needs of the department for trained workers.

With respect to the proposed bill for the Association of Social Workers, there has been some consultation with our department. We had a few objections originally to it; one of them is for them monopolizing the name social worker; we think it should be a licensed social worker, or something to distinguish them from the many other people who go by the name of social worker in this field and this would of course distinguish them from others. I think, as I recall, we have the latest draft that came to us a few weeks ago. The department is still looking at it. I think in general we agree with the idea of trying to assist them in improving the standards and maintaining the standards of the profession, because I think one of their aims is to try to give good service, to try to ensure that their members give good service, to try to ensure that their members are not only well trained but keep up with the latest changes in the profession, keep current and keep active, and we certainly go along with anything that will help social workers to do a better job, both for us, for the agencies in Manitoba and for the people of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, do I take it from the Minister that generally he is in agreement with the establishment of what is requested? and I want to make it clear

MR. CARROLL: I was just going to say that, generally speaking, the department's in agreement. It certainly hasn't been considered by Cabinet and I would certainly not want to make any undertaking yet.

MR. PAULLEY: I can appreciate that Mr. Chairman. I want it clearly understood too that when I was speaking of this type of personnel, the highly trained personnel, I didn't wish to imply that there wasn't any room for those who of lesser qualifications or academic training. I agree with the Minister that there are certain levels or there are levels of categories which can be categorized, should I say, into different functions in the field of social work. The

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) main emphasis which I wished to make was the ever increasing costs of social welfare, which we again endeavour to obtain, does require a more and more fully trained personnel as indeed it does, individuals whose responsibility might only be to collect the necessary data for social allowances allotments and the likes of this and I ask the Minister to consider this matter, and before we meet again possibly we could consult with his colleague and have some legislation, as requested, brought into being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(c) -- passed, 2 (d) -- passed, 2 (e) -- passed, 2 (f) -- passed, 2(g) -- passed, 2 (h) -- passed. Resolution 102 passed. Resolution 103, 3 (a) -- passed, 3 (b) -- passed --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the amount called for in this resolution is down slightly and this is a real change. Now my guess is that this has been made possible by the fact that there are more than rumours circulating that everyone, come January 1st next, will receive Old Age Security Pension at age 69, and therefore will relieve one age group from receiving Old Age Assistance. I wonder if I am correct in my assumption, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to hear comments from my honourable friend.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, under the Canada Pension Plan, people who have attained the age of 69 by January 1st of next year, will be entitled as a matter of right to get the Old Age Pension which will have some impact on this department under the Old Age Assistance program for those who get that. I understand too that there's a considerable amount of work involved in people who are going from Old Age Assistance into the pension category, review of files and a cleaning up of over payments and things of that kind, so there will be a considerable amount of work for people who are leaving the program and the estimates here certainly haven't anticipated any decrease in staff, by virtue of the fact that the Canada Pension Plan is coming in. This was just a decrease for other reasons, more efficiency within the department.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, it should reduce by one-fifth approximately the number of people than can qualify under Old Age Assistance. Previously and presently, all persons between 65 and 70 qualify. -- (Interjection) -- Well they could make application then.

MR. CARROLL: A lot of people die between 65 and 69; that's the reason why it isn't exactly one-fifth, but it is true that there will be a number who will go off because they are going to the Old Age Security.

MR. PAULLEY: In this regard, I would like to make a comment. I said a moment ago that we in this group are advocating from time to time, almost continuously, increases in the area covered by welfare services. At the present time, in our province and indeed many others if not all of the provinces across Canada, there is an area, a grey area and a dark grey area, of people who are not entitled to receive Old Age Assistance and the Old Age Security. And particularly insofar as females are concerned. And that is the area between the age of 60 and 65. Now generally the husband is four or five years older than the wife. I think this is a general acceptable fact and quite frequently the presumed breadwinner may be over 65, his spouse under 65, and on his death at 65, there is no provision under our Old Age Assistance for women particularly, in this particular category.

Now I know the Minister has heard us in this group at least, speak of this area before and one of the reasons, I suggest, that it hasn't been given too much consideration as far as adopting it is concerned, is because of the economics concerned. And I would like to suggest to the Honourable the Minister, and this would possibly - well, I guess it would have to be in concert with the federal authority. But as the age is reduced from 70 downward insofar as Old Age Security is concerned, that similarly double jumps might be taken insofar as our lady friends are concerned in the area between the age of 60 and 65. We are used to paying out of our provincial treasury these amounts of moneys and it's just been indicated that because of the start of the reduction from age 70 down to 65 in respect of the Old Age Security pension, there will be less moneys required under The Social Allowances Act which of course, as I appreciate, is a joint field between the province and the federal authority. So the saving would only be half provincial-wise but would then have to be made up by the federal authority so the expenditures for this area would continue to be about what they are at the present time.

I would like to ask my honourable friend the Minister if he, in consultation with other Ministers in the other provinces may approach the federal authorities to take this matter under consideration of a gradual reduction in those who qualify for the joint program of social allowances under age 65, and I'm particularly concerned, as I say due to the statistics that I've read, insofar as the women are concerned, should start at the age of 60 and those for men at the age 65. But I'm not pressing this at the present time but I wonder if the Minister would consider,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . as the expenditures reduce by virtue of the reducing age qualifications for Old Age Security that this area may be given more consideration now than ever before.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to hear a comment from the Minister on that but while I'm on my feet I would like to ask the Honourable Minister insofar as the Blind Persons' Allowances and the Disability Allowances, I note that there is a reduction in the contribution to both, so far as total amount is concerned, also the recoveries from the Government of Canada seem to be decreasing. I don't think, unless I'm mistaken, that this has any bearing on the gradual reduction of the age for qualification for Old Age Security. I wonder if there's some reason.

Plus one other question I wish to ask my honourable friend. Has there been any material relaxation in the regulations pertaining to Disability Allowances insofar as the individual and their physical handicaps are concerned?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the reduction in pensions to the age of 60, I think if the Leader of the NDP will consult The Canada Pension Plan Act he'll find that widows will be accommodated to a much lower age than 60 once this Plan becomes operative, and in fact I think the whole status of these categorical programs will be sort of under review in the future because the Canada Pension Plan does contemplate taking care of the disabled, as well as providing pensions for people at retirement age. So I think this whole thing is at the present time in a state of flux, and something that wasn't mentioned at all during my estimates and which I maybe should just mention at the moment is that the Federal Government are contemplating a Canada Assistance Agreement which is patterned identically on The Social Allowances Act in the Province of Manitoba in that it is based on meeting need. I think this appears to be the trend of welfare payments for the future rather than being based on the old Unemployment Assistance Agreement which did leave out very important categories.

With respect to why DA and Blind Persons Allowances are down I suspect it's just a forecast of relatively fewer people involved in these particular categories and there has been no relaxation in the federal regulations dealing with Disability Allowances. They're awfully tough regulations, they're pretty hard for us to live with but we have no choice because they've made the rules and we just have to abide by them.

MR. PAULLEY: Maybe a war on poverty might help.

MR. CARROLL: It might.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (a) -- passed, (b) -- passed, (c) -- passed, (d) -- passed, (e) 1(a) -- passed, (b) -- passed, (2) -- passed. Resolution No. 103 -- passed. Resolution 104, 4 (a) -- passed . . .

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): On 104, I'll be very brief. I would like to commend the Minister on this program and I mean in relation to grants to municipalities. I don't intend to speak for all the province, but in my constituency certainly these grants to municipalities have helped in developing what is the aim of the program as I see it in the report here, which is to upgrade standards of community programs and leadership and thus raise the level of social, mental and physical well-being. And certainly I speak for the people in my constituency who have qualified for this program and I think this has helped very much in small communities in helping youngsters develop programs which have helped promote sports and also general organization in the small communities and also I would like to pay tribute to the Director, Mr. Al Miller, who I think is well versed in this line and certainly is doing a very good job as far as I am concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) -- passed, (b) -- passed, (c) -- passed, (d) -- passed, 104 -- passed. Resolution 105 -- passed. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the 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 9:30 Wednesday morning.