

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Monday, February 13, 1967

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before we rose for the supper hour I was making a few remarks in reply to the Honourable the Minister of Labour on his remarks dealing with the budget and in particular some of his statements respecting the position of labour and the New Democratic Party, because my honourable friend had accused those of us who represent the New Democratic Party in this House; he didn't use the terminology of irresponsibility but it might have been inferred when he said that we had advocated certain expenditures and yet at the same time we hadn't made propositions as to the raising of money by taxation or other methods. I don't agree with my honourable friend. I think one of the last things that we can be accused of in this party is irresponsibility, because we have consistently and persistently said in this House and outside of it, that those things which we desire for the people of Manitoba have to be paid for, and if it is necessary to raise revenues then we are quite prepared to raise those revenues. As a matter of fact my colleague, the member for St. John's, said so this afternoon when he was delivering his budget criticism directed toward the Provincial Treasurer.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Labour indicated that the government had been commended on a number of occasions by Labour in their brief to the government, and during the supper hour I did take the time out to look over the last brief of the Manitoba Federation of Labour which was presented to the government on Saturday, 28th of January, and I must agree with my friend the Honourable the Minister of Labour insofar as the commendation of the Labour boys to the government, because on page 22 of the brief in the conclusion the representatives say, "This completes our presentation, Mr. Premier and gentlemen. We express our appreciation for your courteous attention and for the time you have given us." So the Honourable Minister is perfectly correct when he says that Labour commends the government.

I only wish however, Mr. Speaker, that the government were just as courteous to the Leader of the New Democratic Party when he is making a presentation as apparently they were at the time the Federation of Labour was making their presentation, and outside of the last sentence or so in the brief that was presented, Mr. Speaker, I cannot find any other commendation to the government or to the Minister of Labour. But that be it what it may be, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention at this particular time to carry on with the debate that was started so spiritedly this afternoon by the Minister of Labour, and I hope and trust that other members, particularly of the front benches, will take part in the budget debate, so I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the Minister of Labour for his spirited defence of the government. I can appreciate the anguish of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer because of the fact that he had to impose this insipid tax, the sales tax, on the people of Manitoba, and I can appreciate too the fears of the First Minister lest the curtain of the true facts insofar as the economy of Manitoba be rolled back so all can see how his leadership has not augured well for Manitoba. So I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the fears and apprehensions of the government. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is not with us tonight. I can sympathize with him. He's a very amiable, charming young fellow who has just recently entered into the field of politics. He has been given a very great responsibility as the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. I can appreciate that he may be a little naive insofar as the operation of government is concerned. I am sure, however, that before too long his eyes will be opened and he'll see the facts insofar as the government is concerned as we on this side of the House can see them as well.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, to my friend the Minister of Labour, impress upon your colleagues the desirability, indeed the necessity of entering into this debate. It's altogether too long since we've heard from other members of the party opposite, the government. We've heard from the First Minister from time to time, sometimes when he's looking through those blue eyes of his it may seem as though his glasses are rather tinted.....

MR. ROBLIN: My eyes are grey.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: They're grey. I had a look.....

MR. PAULLEY: He's decided - they're grey this evening, Mr. Speaker, and this is so typical of government of Manitoba. He told me this afternoon his eyes were blue and lo and behold here, five minutes after we start this evening session they are grey, and I guess before too long he'll agree with me at least that he has been looking at Manitoba through rose-coloured glasses. -- (Interjection) -- You make your own speech.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I welcome, as I said, the spirited contribution to the debate by my friend the Minister of Labour. I trust the successor to the First Minister may give us of his abilities before this debate is over. I'm hoping to hear from the Honourable the Provincial Secretary who appeared at least this afternoon to be paying attention to the criticisms of my colleague from St. John's, and who better in the House opposite, on the opposite side of this House, could we hear from than the Honourable Minister of Highways who I understand is a dark ringer in the competition for the job of the Honourable the First Minister. I want to hear from all you fellows and may I suggest to you that you enter into the debate with the same spirit as the Honourable Minister of Labour did this afternoon.

MR. ROBLIN: I'd almost think you were trying to get rid of me.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh goodness no, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get rid of my honourable friend except I think Manitoba would be better off without him. I like my charming friend but by jove, you know, Manitoba can only stand so much and maybe it would be well for the federal Conservatives to take my honourable friend off of our hands. The big question that arises, however, could things be worse? And as I on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I say with you that I must be careful of my choice of words, I think possibly it could be, but I wonder if and who would be that individual. So come on, boys, enter into the discussion. Defend the indefensible if you can, but do it in the same manner that was attempted this afternoon by the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: I was wondering whether or not the Leader of the New Democratic Party was entering the field of anticipation.

I wonder if we may deal now with the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: May I have this item stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Second reading of Bill No. 24. The Honourable the Minister of Highways.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

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

MR. 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 Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XVII, Welfare. Resolution 115.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to start my comments this evening along the same lines and on the same theme as the Honourable the Minister of Welfare by saying how much I appreciate the co-operation and assistance that I have received from the civil servants of this department over the years. I think on every occasion that I have spoken on the welfare estimates I have made the comment that I spend more time in my duties as ombudsman in the field of Welfare than I do in any other activity in my position. Last Saturday, for instance, when I arrived home I was notified that I would have several callers to see me and I think five of them had to do with welfare problems, and I don't know whether I am any exception to the rule but it does seem to me that people that are on welfare or are in receipt of assistance of one kind or another, are numerous - I'll admit that; there's a large number of them - and they are deserving of attention and so I want to publicly announce how much I appreciate the co-operation that I get from all of the social workers and the welfare workers in my area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having said that, any criticisms that I do have are directed entirely to my honourable friend because as head of the department, like any other Minister, he is responsible for the entire department and it is to him that I direct my criticism, if any. And I want to say on the outset that I question whether a man in his position, one who has recently voted himself a huge increase in his salary and in addition a \$3,000 tax-exempt out-of-pocket sum of \$3,000 bonus, tax free, one that he does not have to account for to anybody, the public

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) or the government apparently, for this \$3,000; no means test, no nothing, no needs test, I question whether he is in a position to assess the needs of people whose income is about 25 percent of his pocket spending money - his out-of-pocket spending money. And I suggest to him that in order to qualify himself for the position that he is in that he should follow the example perhaps of Val Werier and go out and live in some of these areas for about 30 days on Higgins or north Winnipeg or some of these places north of the tracks so that he could really acquaint himself to the circumstances under which a lot of people are obliged to live in this day and age, and after having served 30 days in conditions of this kind, then he can really appreciate what the needs of the people are who live north of the tracks. I suggest to him too that 95 percent of the people -- well, 100 percent of the people who are in receipt of social allowances of one kind or another are below, much below what my honourable friend spends in the way of pocket money.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the weekend I have already said at least five people were in to see me, complaining about or making application for social allowance and Medicare, and I'm happy to note from the remarks of my honourable friend that he intends to introduce a whole new schedule - we haven't received it yet - but a whole new schedule of basic needs, but three of the five people that came in to see me were people that were turned down; they had made application for social allowance and were turned down on the grounds that they had seven or eight dollars, according to him, seven or eight dollars that they didn't know what to do with.

Now, I have in my possession here several letters that go out to individuals and they are all basically the same. I think I have one right here close at hand. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has it because I wrote him a letter on February 8th and he hasn't replied to it yet, so I'll refer Mr. Minister to my letter of February 8th. My honourable friend will have this one, and it's just a typical kind of a letter that goes out to people who have been turned down, and it says, "Dear Mr. So and So - this is dated January 30th, 1967 - " We must advise you that your application for benefits under The Social Allowances Act has been rejected. Under social allowance regulations a person in your circumstances requires \$60.00" -- and so you're getting \$75.00 and you've got \$15.00 left over and you don't need any help from us. That's exactly what they're saying in this letter and they're saying it to this fellow; they're saying it to this fellow; and a good number of other people. They say we - that is the department - has assessed your needs; you need \$60.00; you're getting \$75.00; you've got \$15.00 left over and that's ample. Good-bye and God bless you. This is what they're saying.

Now in light of the statement that my honourable friend made the other day, and I have the Hansard right in front of me, what is he going to do with the hundreds and thousands of letters that have gone out like this, because if I interpret the statement that our honourable friend made on February 10th, he is going to be so generous that he is going to allow the old people to keep this \$90.00 that they're going to get about April 1st from the Federal Government. Now what do you know about that, Mr. Chairman? He says that the Federal Government have decided that all of those people who qualify for the guaranteed annual wage of \$30.00 in addition to their \$75.00 - it will bring up their total pension then to \$105.00 and it's going to be retroactive to January 1st, paid from the Federal Government - my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare says they can keep that. He has decided that he'll let them have it. Well who is he to say they shouldn't have it? That's what I say. Who is he to say that it's not their money.

Now what is he going to do about cases like my friend, of whom I wrote to my honourable friend on February 8th, that's just been turned down because he's got \$15.00 left over now. What is he going to do about the hundreds and thousands of letters like this. Is he going to assess each and every one of them and say, "Listen, we have introduced a new schedule and now lo and behold we assess your needs at \$76.00 and we'll give you a dollar, but if you get \$30.00 from the Federal Government, you don't get anything." What are we going to do? My honourable friend must have thousands of cases like this in the province over the last two or three years who have been turned down because according to him \$69.14 is enough - according to him because he establishes the need - they're getting 75, so they've got \$5.86 left over and they don't need anything else. So what's he going to do? That's what I'd like to know and I hope that he will be able to reply to my satisfaction when he makes a statement of this kind, because it looks to me as if every file - every file - and according to my honourable friend there's something like -- what, 60,000 that are presently in receipt of Medicare - every file, am I right? -- (Interjection) -- there's not 60,000? Well, how many are there?

MR. CARROLL: The annual report tells you there.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, you made the statement the other day so you should know how many there are. But it doesn't matter whether there's 40,000, 50,000 or 60,000, each and every person that is presently in receipt of Medicare, their entire file will have to be reviewed, and not only they will have to be reviewed but every application that they have received and rejected in the last 12 months will have to be reviewed in light of the statements that my honourable friend made the other night, because he intends to introduce a complete new schedule. He's going to allow them \$5.00 more for food, and he isn't specific on what he's going to allow them for rent - he's pretty cagey on that one - the only comment that he has made, in fact, is that after reviewing them and considering the increase in the cost of living in the last three or four years, he thinks maybe they better have another \$5.00 to buy food with.

Now, I wonder if he has prepared the schedule, that is the new basic needs schedule - I think that's the term my honourable friend uses - and if he has, would he mind tabling it before he gets through with the Welfare estimates. Would that be too unfair to ask my honourable friend to table the new schedule, because I don't think that it has changed since the introduction of social allowances in 1959 or 1960. It hasn't changed, eh?

MR. CARROLL: It's changed many times.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It has? Well, I've got the 1961 here and if it's changed many times, it's inched its way up then, Mr. Chairman, it's inched its way up, because it's still only three or four dollars above what it was in 1960. But does my honourable friend really intend to supply us with this new schedule? He may say, "Well, it's in the Gazette." Who in the world ever reads the Gazette? Who reads the Gazette outside of me? I flip to the back pages --

MR. CARROLL: ... probably wants to get it published in the Neepawa Press.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It doesn't get published. I know my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, you and I both subscribe to the propaganda sheets, I'm sure, but this is one thing they do not publish in the propaganda sheets and that is the new schedule of basic needs -- complete in every detail, they don't. And surely, surely it's not being unfair to ask my honourable friend to table it so we can see where we're at, so we'll know what we're talking about. And if he does, I want to ask him this. Has he considered the impact that the new 5 percent sales tax will have on the cost of living for everybody on social allowances. Has he considered that and taken it into account when he has prepared this new schedule, because you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that when that famous heat tax was imposed on us poor people a while ago, that he -- I think he admitted that it could affect, seriously affect a lot of people that were in receipt of social allowances and that he intended to up the schedule by reason of the heat tax, the telephone tax and so on and so forth.

Now, when I wrote my honourable friend the Minister the other day on February 8th, I really expected to get a reply before I spoke on the welfare estimates, and I'm certain that he intended to give me a reply so that I wouldn't have to refer to this document, because I said in my letter to my honourable friend -- do you mind if I read it? I didn't say it was confidential. You don't mind if I read it, eh?

MR. CARROLL: Go ahead, read it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I say: "Dear Mr. Minister:" - February 8th. "Mr. So and So made application for social allowances some weeks ago and is now in receipt of a letter from the Department of Welfare advising him that his application has been rejected, the reason for his application being turned down being that his basic needs are \$60.00 and his regular income (old age pension) of \$75.00 is \$15.00 in excess of his basic needs.

"Mr. So and So for many years lived all alone in a shack at Mountain Road. This winter, because of failing health, he has moved in with his brother in Neepawa. In 1966, Mr. So and So paid \$182.50 for medical services and in addition is indebted to the Winnipeg Clinic in the amount of \$275.00 for services rendered by them. Mr. So and So is not in a position to pay the Winnipeg Clinic the amount they are now demanding of him, and they want an explanation as to why he has paid no heed to former statements they have mailed to him demanding payment.

"Surely, Mr. Minister, the foregoing facts establish that he is deserving of a Medicare card at least, because his medication alone far exceeds the \$15.00 that your department claims to be in excess of his basic needs. Would you be good enough to make a reassessment of Mr. So and So's basic needs at your early convenience. He cannot afford to wait until he is in receipt of the \$105.00 guaranteed by the Federal Government."

And I attached, I believe - or did I not, a statement from the Winnipeg Clinic demanding

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . the \$275.00. I didn't attach that? Well, I wasn't bluffing. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Minister, I wasn't bluffing. Here is the statement from the -- well he enclosed his receipts for medication to the doctors, one for \$14.00, \$26.00, \$60.00 and \$23.00 - you can add them up for yourself - and \$59.50. There's all of those, and he still owes the Winnipeg Clinic \$275.00 for their services rendered in 1966. My honourable friend says he's got \$15.00 more than he knows what to do with and doesn't qualify for a Medicare card. Well if he paid his medication, he wouldn't have nearly enough. And this is just one of the many cases that come in to see me and say that the schedule that you have established of \$60.00 for cases of this kind is simply out-of-date. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when my honourable friend does have the courage to table the new schedule of fees, that he will show us in detail how he reckons that a single man is getting ample at \$60.00.

MR. CARROLL: Who signed the letter to your friend that was turned down?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Who signed the letter? Do you want me to name the social worker that signed it? Did I not send you a copy . . .

MR. CARROLL: Was it one of our workers?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Certainly it's one of your workers, and he's a very good friend of mine. And I want to say this my honourable friend - I'm glad my honourable friend raised this point - this worker that works out of the Portage office is a relatively new worker, and he replaced a fellow who has been with the department for several years and a diplomatic kind of a person; and, Mr. Chairman, I will confess that a civil servant who has ability and diplomacy is hard to get. I'll admit that, but if you have both, for Heaven's sake try and retain him. But do you know, do you know what he told me - and I'm not going to mention any names - that is the former social worker who for seven or eight years I guess was with the department at Portage - he said the department had now decided that I had to go back to school for another year or something in order to qualify me for the position I hold. Here's a man with eight years' experience who was an expert in his field, so the department say, "Listen, I think that you've reached the stage where you've got to go back to school and find out what your job is all about." My gosh, if there's anybody that can tell anybody else how to run the department, it's him, after eight years of dealing with the public. So I think - I'm not certain, but I think that he quit the department completely and went with the federal - Canada Pension Plan or something of that kind. He said to heck with it if that's what they want me to do.

Now my honourable friend in his statement the other day - and I know, Mr. Chairman, we're not supposed to read speeches, but some of the speeches that the Ministers make are so intriguing and interesting that I do like to read them - but my honourable friend the Minister leaves the inference here that he is taking care of everybody; he's taking care of all of the municipal cases that are on relief and all this kind of business. How is it, how is it that social allowances are costing municipalities more today than they ever did? How is that, in light of the statement that my honourable friend has just made. The City of Winnipeg I think, for instance, pays a lot more for in the way of social services of all kinds than they ever did, and my honourable friend tries to pretend that he's taken the load completely off their back. He says, "The province therefore" - Page 974, quoting my honourable friend - "The province therefore looks after all of the aged and infirm, the desertions over one year, the widows with families and others in this Mothers' Allowance category, the blind, the physically and mentally disabled, the unemployed, child welfare," and so on and so on. "Therefore" - he ends up the statement by saying, "Therefore, we do all this." They're not doing it therefore. They're not doing it. There are plenty of people in this province who are unemployable by virtue of the fact that nobody will hire them. Why won't they hire them? Because of a physical or mental disability, they're unemployable for these reasons. My honourable friend isn't looking after them all. One of the people that called to see me on Saturday was in this category, and I'm not condemning anybody for not hiring them, because they're not capable of carrying out their duties, that's why; they're unemployable, and so I say they are not looking after them as they should.

When I'm on this subject of the people who called in to see me, I might as well finish up with the third one. I'm only going to make this comment that a lady came in to see me and she said, "I agreed to accept the social allowance case" - and it's a blessing that she did, it's one of those problems that you don't like to talk about too much - but she hasn't been paid for her services, after two months. Why not? Why hasn't she? I think I wrote my honourable friend about this as well and still haven't had a reply. Anyway, for your information it's case No. 64190 and you can probably see why this lady should have to continue to wait for the services that she has rendered, and it's a blessing for my honourable friend that she agreed to

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . accept this individual.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I notice in the estimates that the amount that we are expected to vote on for social allowances is up about \$5 million. I see that. In fact, Social Allowances went up from 14,735 to 19. My guess is that at the end of the fiscal year we'll find out that it was not all used. Now you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that in October, 1963, 3 1/2 years ago, there was a great to-do by the Department of Welfare, and this was the time when the Old Age Pension went from \$65.00 to \$75.00 - and a statement came out from my honourable friend's department and it said the province may cut age allowances. Ten thousand Manitoba welfare recipients could be affected by the decision made by my honourable friend. You recall that, because it was certainly one of heated debate for a long time, because actually what my honourable friend said, that we are supplying everyone with their basic needs and we have assessed their needs at \$55.00 and they're now going to get \$75.00 from the government, therefore they don't need this money.

My guess is we will have a repetition of that come April 1st when all of these people receive \$105.00 instead of \$75.00. My honourable friend will then reassess them all and he'll write these fellows and say, "We have been paying you \$29.00 or \$27.00 or \$13.00 or \$9.00 or \$12.00 for the last year or so. Now that you're getting this supplement of \$30.00 from the Old Age Security Division in Ottawa, you don't need it any more. They are telling the other fellow what they need, and not only telling the other fellow what they need, they're telling themselves what they need, because my honourable friend is in a position to know who needs what and when, because the first thing they did after the election was increase their own salary on September 7th and they really needed it. That was number one priority following the election, and so keeping in that practice they tell everybody else exactly what they need. But my guess is that come about April 1st there'll be a whole raft of letters go out saying: We are sorry to advise you - we're not going to take your Medicare card away, but I'll tell you what we're going to do. We're going to let you keep that \$90.00 that you got for January, February and March, you can keep that. Our heart bleeds for you so you can keep that. And I'll tell you what we'll do, we'll let you have your Medicare card but we're not going to pay you any more social allowances. Now I predict right now that there'll be a lot of those letters go out and I will challenge my honourable friend to say that they will not go out because my guess is they will, the same as they did back three years ago. So then how's he going to spend another \$5 million in light of all this? That's what I'd like to know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, someone this afternoon, I guess it was the Honourable Member for St. George and I don't know whether this comes under my honourable friend's department or not, but he brought to the attention of the House an article that appeared on Page 3 - I guess of the Winnipeg Free Press - today's edition, final edition, headed: "Theft is the Biggest Juvenile Headache", and it goes on to say that there were 2,720 cases of juvenile delinquency handled by the Winnipeg Juvenile and Family Courts in 1965. My guess is that it was nearly the same in 1966. My guess is too that there is only accommodation for about one-tenth of this number over at Vaughan Street Jail. I have been told on pretty good authority that the accommodation over at Vaughan Street Jail is -- they only have accommodation over there for about 10 or 12 persons. This is what I'm told, and yet there's about twice or three times that number that are kept over there of a night.

Now I don't know whether this comes under my honourable friend's department or not but it certainly touches on the welfare of the people, and I certainly would like to have some comment from my honourable friend as well as the Attorney-General on this one, because if the facts are as reported to me, then there's something drastically wrong - something drastically wrong. If they are in fact handling 2,720 cases in a year and half of them are kept overnight in Vaughan Street, then there must be a serious overcrowding of the accommodation that's available over there. So perhaps my honourable friend could comment on that when he gets up to reply.

I have said on several occasions that one of the reasons that there is discontent and dissatisfaction in the Department of Welfare, one of the major reasons, is due to the fact that there does not seem to be any standard basic program or needs test for all categories. There isn't. What yardstick do you use? What yardstick do you use and say now this applies to Old Age Assistance, this applies to Blind Persons' Pension, this applies to City Welfare, this applies to Welfare at Roblin, this applies to Welfare down at Steinbach and Swan River, and so on. There just seems to be a standard for every community in Manitoba. There's certainly a different standard, a different yardstick used when they make application for Old Age

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) Assistance; there's one used when you make application for Blind Persons' Pensions; and this is one of the major reasons we have problems.

An article that appeared last year in The Tribune, apparently as a result of a statement made by my honourable friend, is headed: "A Set Standard is Sought for Aided Relief Programs. Welfare Minister J. B. Carroll said the government is working for standards at present and may have a solution to the problem within a year, adding that everyone will be looked after in the proper manner. He noted that the Canada Assistance Plan demands standards and provides for appeals by anyone who feels he is hard done by." Well, my honourable friend made this statement over a year ago and I wonder whether or not he has in fact come up with a solution - that's the word he uses - a solution to the problem within a year. Have we got a solution to the problem? He recognized a year ago there was in fact a problem. Has he got the solution?

An article put out two or three years ago in the Tribune written by Val Werier and headed: "Too Many Cooks Prepare the Welfare Broth," points up exactly what I have been saying, and he goes on to say - Val Werier - "In Winnipeg today, several agencies may be involved at the same time or over an extended period with various members of one family. Here's an example of what may happen with a child delinquent. Any one of the following agencies could be called on the case: Family Bureau, Juvenile Court, Children's Aid, Child Guidance Clinic or the John Howard Society." Any one of the six could be called on, and, Mr. Chairman, my guess is that every one of the six would have a different standard that they have established over the years, and herein lies a lot of the confusion. My honourable friend said a year ago they were going to come up with a solution. What is it? Have they, and if so, are they going to table it?

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, I'm certain, that a year ago I referred to two articles I believe, one put out by the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg and another one put out by the YWCA. In fact they were presentations, I believe, that were made to the government perhaps, and to the Department of Labour, setting out what they considered to be the minimum upon which any one person or a family could live in the City of Winnipeg, and you will recall that we went over it pretty well with a fine tooth comb, and my honourable friend, he had his pencil all sharpened up, and we went over it and we found that here again there was a grave variance in the two schedules. Now, who is right?

The Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg that apparently do a great deal of work in this entire field, wrote me on February 10, 1967, and that is not very long ago because this is the 13th, and here is what they say in part: "Dear Mr. Shoemaker: Further to your telephone request" - because I wrote and asked them if they had any up-to-date information other than what I had a year or two ago - and they say, "Our budget outline includes health services, donations, saving, and some extras," they admit, "for which most public assistance programs makes little allowance, being geared to provisions of minimum basic needs only. Any price and tax increases which occur seriously affect the purchasing power of those on fixed incomes for public assistance. We feel this must be considered in evaluating current welfare standards" - they're telling me that by reason of the five percent sales tax, that any information they give me will have to be scaled up, this is what they're telling me when you read between the lines - "an issue which frequently confronts us in the variation in standards of assistance and service among municipalities. We view with enthusiasm the trend of the Provincial Government towards assuming increasing financial responsibility in categorical public assistance programs. Eligibility standards and rates of assistance vary widely among the municipalities according to the strength of their financial status and attitudes towards public assistance needs. Due to the lack of clear and adequate basic standards in the municipalities, family hardship is often prolonged or added to by factors directly related to this and to the area where the family happens to live." They're saying exactly what I've already told my honourable friends.

And they enclose with the letter: "Enclosed is our estimate of a livable budget for a family of five, two adults and three small children," and they go on to say that we have not specified the ages of the children, and so on, and they set out what they believed to be a minimum livable budget, and it is just about double what my honourable friends are saying to the people of Manitoba, "We have assessed your needs, this is what you need, and that's it." And if my honourable friend would like me to, I will go over them all again, but surely I don't have to do that. But they end up by saying that in the City of Winnipeg, a family of two adults and three small children require a minimum of \$303.70 - \$303.70. Well, you've already

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) heard what I have read here about them turning down this fellow at \$60.00 because they said he had \$15.00 too much out of his old age pension.

Well, the point I'm trying to make is, somebody is wrong - somebody is wrong. Either my honourable friend's assessment is incorrect, they have not correctly assessed their needs and will have to reassess them all now in light of the guaranteed income; or - or the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg are all wet, and I would appreciate some comments from my honourable friend when he gets up to reply. Which one is wrong? Who in fact has made the greatest study in depth, if you want to use that word, because it's a wonderful phrase that my honourable friends like to use when you talk about people making a study, they say "Oh well, you haven't made one in depth, you haven't got down deep enough."

Well, have my honourable friends dug deep enough on this one, or who has dug the deepest, the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, the YWCA, or my honourable friends? Which one is right? Let's get some standards here so that if you're talking to people down at Winkler or you're talking to people at Swan River, or you're talking to people in the Jarvis area, or Higgins or Selkirk Avenue, they'll all know exactly what you mean when you say, here's our yardstick and here it is; let's get together so there'll be less confusion than we presently have. The submission of the YWCA to the Minimum Wage Board - surely my honourable friend is in receipt of that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: honourable member he has been speaking beyond the forty minutes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, what do you know about that? Then if that is so, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I will let my honourable friend speak for a minute or two and then I will get up again, because I'm

MR. GUTTORMSON: he's speaking for us, he can speak beyond the . . .

MR. CARROLL: I wonder if I might ask the member for Gladstone if he'd table the letter from the Family Bureau so we might be able to have a look at it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I would be delighted. You know, I kind of expected this and I've got about three copies, and I am

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member is speaking as the Opposition Leader, he may speak beyond the forty minutes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you very kindly, and I will now proceed to table -- I imagine, Mr. Chairman, that all my honourable friend is interested in is the letter. Now while this letter from the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, the one that I'm going to table, is dated March 31, 1965, they tell me in their accompanying letter that it has not changed, that is they have not prepared a new one. So the \$303.00 that I referred to - \$303.70 that I referred to is the 1965 livable budget, and so that if in the two-year interval the cost of living has gone up by five percent or six percent or seven percent - five percent by reason of the new tax - then you would have to add a further five percent on to the \$303.70. And so, Mr. Chairman, this one - I have a few yellow strokes in it - I have one of those illuminated pencils which I find so helpful in the House and I hope that my honourable friend will find it as helpful as I have.

And then if my honourable friend would like me to table the submission of the YWCA as well - it's a most interesting document and I would be delighted to table this one as well - but it was the submission of the YWCA to the Minimum Wage Board made in January, 1963, four years ago, so that any figures they give here would have to be up-rated by the cost of living increase in the last four years. But they say, "As the YWCA is engaged in various ways in contributing to the well-being of women and girls in the community, the course of our work gives us considerable opportunity to know the needs" - that's a favourite word with my honourable friends - "to know the needs of young women, the cost of meeting these needs," and so on. They say - they say that the minimum amount that a single girl can get by with in Winnipeg is \$1,781.24 a year - \$1,781.24 a year - that's the minimum, they say, and that was as of January, 1963. My honourable friend sends letters out every day to say we have assessed your needs and you're getting \$75.00 a month now and that's \$15.00 more than you need, give us back 15. And so, Mr. Chairman, I'll table this one as well, because I know it will be helpful to my honourable friend when he is coming up with this new schedule of fees.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the last schedule that I have before me I found in the Gazette of -- well, it says this is the Manitoba Regulation 14/64 as amended by Manitoba Regulation 12/65 and 20/65, being a regulation under The Social Allowances Act, and it proceeds then to set out

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) the new schedule, and there's two or three pages of it, and my guess is that it is the most recent schedule. Has there been one since 1965, or is this it? There's been several since then -- (Interjection) -- not several -- there has been one. Well, I wonder if my honourable friend would care to table the last one that he has.

You know, it's an interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, that when the Cabinet voted themselves this huge increase in salary on September 7th, it was not necessary to list that in the Gazette. It was not necessary -- no, it wasn't necessary. I asked that, in fact I went in to the Clerk's office and they said that it was not necessary to publish that regulation in the Gazette. It was public information, that is you could go and demand it but they didn't publish that in the Gazette. They increased their own salary by about \$8,000 and they didn't need to publish that; but they upped the schedule \$5.00 for all of the social welfare cases and they had to list that. Well why shouldn't they have to list the both of them, because both of them are touching on the welfare of the people. It's true, not in the same way, but they both apply the needs test, I understand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that my honourable friend said the other day in his statement that this new guaranteed annual wage that the Federal Government had decided to pay had really thrown him for a loop. He didn't use exactly that word, but he said -- I think I can find it here -- It had thrown them right into real chaos -- a real chaotic situation had occurred in their department. They were getting along nicely until the government come along and said we're going to pay another \$30.00 a month and this had upset the apple cart to the extent that nearly everybody was going to quit in their department because they had to work overtime now. What did he mean by a statement of that kind? I'm sure that if somebody come along to me and said listen, I'll tell you what we're going to do -- we're going to give you another \$1,000 a year, I wouldn't lose too much sleep over it. I wouldn't term it chaotic.

And this incidentally, Mr. Chairman, is one other way that the Federal Government has helped out this government that hasn't been mentioned yet I don't think in any of the budget speeches. I know I read an article in the Free Press that said that according to their calculations it would appear that the Provincial Government was getting \$36 million more this year than last year from the Federal Government, and I don't know whether the figures are correct or not; nobody on the opposite side has denied it. But, I don't think that they took into account the impact that this \$30.00 will have on social allowances. Surely it will reduce the expenses a little; surely it will. It won't be so chaotic that it will result in them paying more.

"Over the past year" -- I'm reading now from Page 975 of Hansard -- "Over the past year steadily increasing prices in essential commodities have placed a good deal of strain on the budgets of individuals and families in receipt of social allowances." That's what they say. And I imagine that the government, after making a statement of that kind and phrased and worded the way it is, they didn't take into consideration that the sales tax would up the cost of living by about \$50.00 per person. Surely they didn't.

I'm trying to find where he used the word "chaos" here and I know he used it a couple of times. Oh yes, here we are, Page 976, he said "I would like to just point out that this has caused real chaos coming as it does with the retroactive feature built into it." That's one of the reasons I guess it was so chaotic they have had to say, I'll tell you what we'll do, you can keep that \$90.00.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that I will have the opportunity to speak again following my honourable friend the Minister, because I imagine that he's going to come up now with some earth shaking statements -- and I have several other letters here from people who have been turned down -- they've made application for social allowance, several of them who have been turned down because their \$75.00 is far more than they need. If my honourable friend would like me to table some of them I will slip out and have them get a photograph copy made and then I'll be prepared to table them, at that time. So, Mr. Chairman, with that, I will eagerly await some comments from my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I might just make a few remarks. Considering the estimates of the Department of Welfare, this historically, Mr. Chairman, is a department where we usually have quite a donnybrook between the Minister and myself and other members of this group. But my main purpose at this particular time is not to chastize my honourable friend too much but rather to compliment the Department of Welfare in the Province of Manitoba -- and I'm speaking of the personnel -- and I want to particularly express my appreciation for all the services that I have received from the Deputy Minister and I wish him well toward a complete recovery with his physical ailments that he has at the present time.

But I also want to pay a tribute to a man who I think has rendered invaluable service to the Province of Manitoba. The Minister announced that he will be retiring this year, and I'm referring to Mr. Sid McArton whose title I believe has been Director of Welfare Services, and I want to say how much I personally appreciate what this man has done for me, an individual, every time that I've had a problem with which he is concerned with in his department. I wish to Mr. McArton every good luck in his retirement, and I wish, Mr. Chairman, to the department, that whoever is the successor to Mr. McArton will conduct himself or herself with the same zeal and devotion to duty that Mr. McArton has exhibited in his term of office.

I also want to pay tribute at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, to the various service clubs and organizations who are building nursing homes and hostels and senior citizens homes in the province. I'm happy to be able to report as the Member for Radisson and the City of Transcona that just recently the Honourable Minister of Welfare was in my fair city at the official opening of a senior citizens home constructed under the auspices of the Kiwanis Club of Transcona.

I'm also pleased to inform the House that within a month or so there will be opened in the City of Transcona a Personal Care Home built under the auspices of the Seventh Day Adventists. It's a revelation for one to see the not quite completed institution that is being built and I'm sure that it will be of the very highest type of a home and will render a service to the community. Which leads me to one point which I wish to suggest to the Minister that more emphasis be laid by the department and the personnel in the department toward the construction of nursing homes, hostels and personal care homes. There is a sorry lack in the Province of Manitoba at the present time and we need more emphasis and more activity in this field. In saying this of course I appreciate very much what has been done thus far, Mr. Chairman, but there is so much to be done.

And while I'm talking of nursing homes and hostels, I would like to pay a tribute to a little hospital in the suburb of Elmwood in the Greater Winnipeg area, one called Concordia Hospital. It's been my privilege, Mr. Chairman, when necessary, to go into this little hospital that is operated by a Mennonite Society and my physical condition this evening I can attribute to the care that I have received on a number of occasions in Concordia Hospital. It's one of these little hospitals, Mr. Chairman, where there is really personal care to the individual and they are in the process, as is well known I believe, of undertaking plans for the building of a larger hospital.

Now my purpose is not to talk of the hospital itself but the use for which the same people, this same society, Mr. Chairman, hopes to use its present facility after their new hospital is constructed, because as I understand the plans of the Mennonite Society their plans are that the present hospital will be used for hostel care purposes, that in conjunction with their hospital to be built in East Kildonan -- commencing I believe sometime possibly this fall with the service installations and completion date some time in 1968 or full construction in 1968 -- but in conjunction with the hospital it is their intention as I understand it, to build a personal care home in conjunction with the hospital. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Welfare get together with the Minister of Health and co-operatively work together so that we can have our new Concordia Hospital in East Kildonan and also start the work now for the personal care home which is going to be built in the same general area. As a matter of fact, as I understand the plans, the hospital and the personal care home will be linked together by a tunnel and the idea behind all of this is so that rather than have the personal care home divorced from the hospital as is the case in many instances when medical personnel are at work in the hospital their services will be available in the personal care home adjacent as well.

So I want to appeal to the Minister of Health and also to the Minister of Welfare to really get cracking. I understand that at the present time there are two sections of the same society,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the Mennonite Society, one in the field of personal care and the other in the hospital at the present time. Chances are they will get together and I want the Minister of Health to get together with the Minister of Welfare so that there be no hitches, no red tape or no possible delay in fulfilling the dreams and objectives of this very very good group of Mennonite citizens in this particular area. And I want to thank them personally for the job they have done on me. It might not have sounded that it was too well this afternoon, but I appreciate it very very much indeed.

I also want to suggest that the Minister of Welfare and the Minister of Health get together in another field as well. I've been trying to cajole the Minister of Health to inform the House as to when we're going to hear about the great Medicare scheme for Manitoba. It seems to me that my honourable friend, the Minister of Health is rather reticent to let us in on the big secret. --(Interjection)-- It could be as my colleague just said that he doesn't know what Medicare scheme is going to be for Manitoba. But I'm sure that the Minister of Welfare is interested in this, Mr. Chairman, and it's this aspect of Medicare that I think is important because the Minister tells us and all through his document, the report, references are made to Medicare and the provision of Medicare costing so many dollars to recipients of social welfare, ward care and the likes of that.

You know my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Welfare used to have this problem insofar as hospitalization was concerned. That was before we got this terrible thing that we call compulsory hospitalization in Manitoba. It used to always be a very sore point with the Department of Welfare because lord, the Provincial Treasury had to pay for it directly. Then along came this socialized hospitalization and all of the citizens of Manitoba collectively through income tax or premiums now pay for hospitalization and those who are less fortunate than others receive a hospital card without the Honourable the Minister of Welfare having to in his estimates put up any money at all.

Now I'm suggesting Mr. Chairman, that this was a very worth-while experiment and has paid dividends to the people of Manitoba so I'm suggesting that my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare sit on the lap of the Minister of Health and plead with him to introduce a Medicare scheme that is universal for all of the citizens of Manitoba so we can all pay and then the estimates of the Minister of Welfare will be reduced accordingly for the provision of medicare and we'll be paying for it in any case. But, by this method it will not be necessary as it is today for those who are less fortunate than ourselves having to plead with some agency of government to receive a Medicare card. It won't be necessary for people to deplete their financial assets down to the level of \$200 per person, which I think is criminal and smacks of the dark ages when we hear from members opposite that Manitoba is a very affluent community.

So I say, Mr. Minister, talk to your friend, your colleague from just the next constituency to the north of yours, The Pas and Flin Flon, you're together up there in northern Manitoba, that great growing part of Manitoba, let a little of the growth come down now to the rest of Manitoba and unitedly come forward into this House at this session with a proper comprehensive medicare scheme that will relieve the department of Welfare of the difficulty of trying to sort out who has \$199 worth of assets and who has \$201 worth of assets. I think it would be a good thing for Manitoba.

While we are talking of assets and the social allowances and social assistance, I note that the federal authority have turned the clock back tremendously once again in the reintroduction of a means test for recipients of old age pensions, at least in respect of the additional \$30.00 over and above the Old Age Security Pension of \$75.00. I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that we haven't heard from the Government of Manitoba in respect of this because while the Provincial Treasurer was introducing his budget the other day he was wont to criticize and to condemn Ottawa for everything, or practically everything, and all of its shortcomings and failings, what a glorious opportunity my honourable friend had of criticizing, and in my opinion quite properly so, the reintroduction of a means test in the field of Old Age Security. But no, I suppose this is a little different from the philosophy of my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury.

Now I have one specific question I would like to ask of my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare. Other colleagues of mine, Mr. Chairman, will be taking part in the discussion on the Welfare estimates, but I would like to know specifically from my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare what will be the effect insofar as increased costs of social allowances because of the sales tax imposed by the Provincial Treasurer. What will be the effect insofar as the amounts to the recipients of social allowances, the effect of the sales tax, either percentage-

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...wise or in dollars? I would like to know from my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, when in the provisions for Old Age Assistance, Social Allowances, there is included an amount of money to take up the added costs of the five percent sales tax or is my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare going to bring about another increase in social allowance payments by way of regulation? Because you know, Mr. Chairman, while my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury has mentioned that there will be certain exemptions for food, certain exemptions for children's clothing, most of those who are on social allowances are not children, they have to still be clothed and I presume that they will have to pay the five percent sales tax either through the department or by way of an added amount to social allowance figures, and I would like to know specifically from the Minister of Welfare what is this percentage-wise? Is it included now? When my honourable friend was making the announcement the other day as to the net effect of the \$30.00 additional pension allowances as the result of the change at Ottawa, did this include the five percent sales tax items?

I think this would be an interesting question of my honourable friend. We await the answer and as I say, Mr. Chairman, I await with great interest the rest of the debate on the Department of Welfare. I'm sure my friend will agree we have been rather easy on him at least at this particular time, but more may come depending on the course of the debate in the Department of Welfare.

Again I want to plead to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, get together with his colleague from Flin Flon; let's get cracking on Concordia complex in East Kildonan and let's get cracking on a proper comprehensive medicare scheme, unitedly, for the people of Manitoba.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, there was one statement made by the Honourable Minister of Welfare that particularly intrigued me, and that was the statement that "We arrived on the scene much too late." It's quite understandable that in the area of welfare it is difficult at times to detect cases in their infancy and to take the necessary steps to prevent them from growing and expanding into more serious problems, but I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether in fact the Department of Welfare is doing everything that ought to be done in this regard.

I turned to the Honourable Minister's annual report to see what happened during the last year. Somewhere within the first few pages of the report the Honourable Minister - or rather I think it was in his presentation, yes in his presentation of the estimates - that he did make the statement this was a direction to the new members, of whom I am one. He asked us to refer to the excellent material in this report and I must say that I did find it most interesting because of the three reports we did have in this session, this was the first one that I have read wherein there were directives to the Minister from his staff as to action that he or the government ought to take.

The first one is found on Page 12 in the report: "Integration of Facilities and Services and co-ordination of effort will be one of the hallmarks of the developing approach." Granted steps in this direction have been taken, but obviously what the department is saying to the Minister is that more decisive action has to be taken in this direction.

The report goes on to advise the Minister, making reference to the fact that there is need for early attention to mental and physical health, vocational guidance, family disintegration, social maladjustment and so forth. And then continuing on the next page, making reference to the fact that the opportunity for help is most effective at the time the problem begins to show and not after it has become aggravated into a chronic state or a series of crises. In other words, what this report does point out is that the millions of dollars alone spent on direct aid to welfare cases, whatever they may be, be they deserted wives, be they neglected children, be they the physically handicapped in some way or another, that in itself is not going to solve the problem. There is need for something more than that. There is need for some action to be taken before the need for this type of financial assistance arises.

It was also interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, on Page 17 of the report, this speaks with reference to the activities of the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society and other such groups. "All these special projects are ventures into the field of prevention or rehabilitation and circumstances where need exists, but where regular policy or procedure does not meet it." In other words, Mr. Chairman, the department is saying to the Minister that there is need to clarify and establish policy in some of these areas in order to enable the department to function in a manner in which it should and discharge the duties with which it is charged,

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)...which obviously does not exist at the present time.

Reading the report in its entirety, Mr. Chairman, points out that there is a lack of liaison and co-ordination of activity with other departments. There is need for exchange of ideas; there is need for communication of problems existing in the various departments. Perhaps if more of that were done some money could be saved in the payment of welfare allowances. Granted that money may have to be spent in other areas to enable the department to obtain this information, to enable the department to establish these lines of communication, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if that were done in the long run money would be saved, and not only would money be saved but we would also contribute towards the building of a healthier society in this country.

I am thinking particularly, Mr. Chairman, of four or five departments. One department that comes to mind is the Attorney-General's department. I suggest that there is need for liaison between those two departments. An incident that comes to mind is one that occurred last summer in one of the northern Manitoba towns. A rash of juvenile delinquency was reported in this little community and naturally the residents of the town were quite disturbed about it. The government was contacted and what was the solution to the problem? Let's send a policeman into that area. Let's send a policeman; the policeman will solve all problems. But I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that it's quite conceivable that the problem lies a bit deeper than that; that the problem lies a bit beyond the reach of the policeman. Nobody in the government asks why is this problem prevalent in that community; what caused it; what causes the misbehavior of these youngsters; but the solution proposed by the government, let's send another policeman to maintain law and order.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that people are not law-abiding citizens just because there happens to be policemen around. There are half a million people in the City of Winnipeg and probably no more than one policeman per 1,500 or 2,000 - I don't know what the figures are - but the vast majority of the people obey the law for reasons other than the fact that there is a policeman in the vicinity, and just putting a policeman in that community is not going to solve the problem. The government did not take the time or the trouble to enquire into what job opportunities there were for the young people in this community; what recreation facilities there were for the young people in this community, what do these people have to do in their spare time and after school. All they said was, "send a policeman." I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in instances such as that, it may be well if the Department of Welfare - if the Honourable Minister of Welfare were to check with the Attorney-General's Department and offer assistance to him. I may also mention here, Mr. Chairman, that it may be well for other Cabinet Ministers to maintain liaison with the Minister of Welfare in the handling of their work.

Not too long ago the Minister of Industry and Commerce went on a trip to Europe to find people to work in sewing factories, to find people to work in mines, to hire people to work in the woods products and the, but I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister of Industry and Commerce did take the time and the trouble to get into his car and drive up into the Interlake area, or drive along the west shore of Lake Manitoba and see if he couldn't find any men over there. I'm sure that there are thousands in that area who would be only too glad to work if they were given the opportunity to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt the Honourable Member for Burrows, you're getting a bit off welfare here. I can't see where

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, what I'm attempting to point out is that there is need for liaison between the activities of the Department of Welfare and the activities of other departments, and here is one area where there should be liaison between the two departments, and if the Minister of Industry and Commerce does not choose to go out and find these men then perhaps he can contact the Honourable Minister of Welfare who knows who these people are and could steer these people to places of employment.

Three or four months ago I was in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition, and --(Interjection)--I was in the Ebb and Flow Indian Reserve, in the southeast corner of his riding, and there were people there - there were many people unemployed, but the sad fact of it was that many of these people knew that there were jobs that they could fill in the City of Winnipeg because there has been some contact between these people over there and places of employment in Winnipeg. The only thing that held them back is probably a twenty dollar bill. They didn't have the amount of the bus fare to get down to Winnipeg; they didn't have the amount to pay the landlady for the first week's rent until the

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)...man got his pay cheque; and knowing that he didn't have those immediate funds that he needed to get himself started, he remained out in the Ebb and Flow country starving.

Now this is an area wherein there is need for greater liaison between the two departments. The Department of Education is another, and here is one area when we're talking about juvenile delinquency, when we're talking about the increasing incidence of juvenile delinquency, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the school provides a source wherein potential juvenile delinquents could be spotted, because there are certain patterns of behavior of students that are indicative of future juvenile delinquency. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that there's very very little communication between the people that fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Welfare and the school authorities, to enable the schools to convey this information to the Welfare Department, that here is a young boy or a young girl that could profit from, could benefit from assistance that could be offered to him by this department, and if this were done, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that even if one worker, even if one worker were successful in steering two or three teenagers back to the straight and narrow each year, he would more than pay his own salary when you take into consideration the financial burden that is created on society if that young man or young lady does go astray.

A short while ago we were dealing with the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. I notice in the report of the Minister of Welfare referring to the problems in the Interlake area, particularly some of the problems dealing with the Indian and the Metis community, and on Page 60, "Expansion of agricultural operations are likely to take place on all reserves if one judges by the interest shown by the delegates who attend conferences and extension courses on this subject." I suggest to the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, that he contact the ARDA Department, that he get himself a map, a map of Manitoba, and I'd like him to find one reserve on this map, find one reserve on this map which is in an area suitable for agricultural purposes. --(Interjection)-- Is this what this map shows? And there are seven reserves, one out of seven, that's some potential for agricultural development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The honourable member may not speak from any place but from his own seat -- I'm directing my remarks to the Minister of Agriculture. You may proceed, but I insist that you direct your remarks to the item that we are on - Welfare. Now, if I'm going to allow you to speak on Welfare and report back to every department, then I'll have to do the same with all the other members in the committee. I cannot allow this.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I was referring specifically to a statement made in a report of the Honourable Minister when he spoke of the development of the agricultural potential in the seven Indian reserves in the Interlake country.

Another area of activity wherein the Honourable Minister of Welfare could become somewhat more active is that of housing - housing for the aged; housing in the economically poor areas wherein there is need for assistance, in the communities of northern Manitoba, in other communities wherever there may be need for same. Not too long ago we hear announced by Ottawa that there's \$800 million sitting there ready for the asking, available for our use. We hear comments that the Province of Manitoba is not taking the maximum advantage of the funds that are available for this purpose. This is another area that I suggest that the Honourable Minister of Welfare take a very close look at.

This brings me down to the area of community development services, a very very worthwhile endeavour, one long overdue. On Page 46 of the Honourable Minister's report, we find the aims of the community development plan listed - 14 points for community development services - this basic aim is broken down into the following constituent parts, and there are 14 of them listed there.

Then, Mr. Chairman, continuing to read this report in an attempt to find just what in effect did the Community Development Branch do, what did it accomplish, I find some interesting things. I find that a new well was dug in Crane River; that 14 ladies were taking sewing classes at Fairford; that a new Town Constable was hired at MacGregor, and the improved relations with the RCMP in MacGregor; and street lighting was installed in Duck Bay - Duck Bay is no large metropolis of the Province of Manitoba, I don't know how many street lights are needed there. But, Mr. Chairman, there are few points in the aims of the community development program about which very little if anything is said. Employment: how many people in fact did find jobs. How many people - what kind of jobs were they placed in; what are their earnings; what effect did those jobs have on the income of the family. On this point the report is silent, Mr. Chairman.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).....

I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman, just how anxious this department is to detect the various problems in need of attention. I'm wondering how anxious the Community Development Department is to do an effective job in the Interlake area, in perhaps even in parts of Metropolitan Winnipeg, or if it's not that particular department of the Welfare Department then some other, in my constituency and some of the northern towns, and I'm sure that the town of the Honourable Minister is no exception, in the Town of Thompson. I'm wondering how many workers the Honourable Minister of Welfare has in the Town of Thompson and just exactly what are they doing.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister check the 1966 voters' list at the Town of Thompson, and it'll be an eye-opener. I'm sure that he's visited the Town of Thompson on many an occasion. It's a very attractive looking town, a modern town, paved streets, single family bungalows, lawns nicely landscaped, side drives, not one car per driveway but two or three, in many cases four, a very very beautiful looking community superficially, but if the Honourable Minister were to check the voters' list, Mr. Chairman, he would find that there are six and eight and nine and ten and as many as fifteen or twenty adults living in each single family dwelling. I'm sure there's no family that enjoys living in a basement suite; I'm sure that there's no family enjoying sharing a basement suite with another family; I'm sure that there's no family enjoying living in a basement suite and only having a little six-foot blanket separating them from the other family; and these are the conditions that we have in our new ultra modern Town of Thompson in the constituency of Churchill, Mr. Chairman. This is the type of situation that the Department of Welfare permits to exist.

I know the reasons why there are seven, eight and nine and ten adults living in a single family dwelling there and in many of them and so does the Honourable Minister, and the people over there know why too, and the reasons are many - economic is one of them; lack of housing accommodation is another. By economic I mean that the wage earner finds himself unable to support his family just from the pay cheque from International Nickel and therefore the wife is forced to supplement the family income by keeping boarders and tenants. That is one of the reasons. But surely, Mr. Chairman, if the Department of Mines and Natural Resources isn't going to do anything about it; if the Department of Industry and Commerce isn't going to do anything about it; and if the Department of Welfare professes to be interested in the welfare of mankind, then surely that department ought to step into that situation and do something about it.

But here again, Mr. Chairman, I must do what you warned me a moment ago that I ought not do, here again we're in a problem that the Minister of Welfare cannot solve alone; here again we're in an area wherein he does need the co-operation and the assistance of the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Forests and Industry and Commerce, because it's a problem beyond his scope of handling. So this is the reason why, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there is need for more liaison and co-ordination of activity with the other government departments if the Department of Welfare hopes to do the job that it ought to be doing.

The Throne Speech made reference to the fact that this year we are celebrating Canada's Centennial and an invitation was extended to the people of Manitoba to come to the party, to come to the Centennial party and celebrate Canada's 100th birthday. Mr. Chairman, I regret to inform you that there are tens, in fact hundreds of thousands of people in Manitoba who will be forced to decline that invitation. They will decline that invitation for the simple reason that they will be unable to afford to participate in the festivities and celebrations that will be held this year. The Economic Council reports will bear this out, Mr. Chairman, and if the Honourable Minister wishes to check those figures he may.

We are concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the cultural enrichment of our community and we're concerned about the cultural enrichment of our province. We're building an Arts Centre in the City of Winnipeg which we publicize to be available to the entire community of the Province of Manitoba, but, Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do that the doors of that Arts Centre are not going to be open to everyone. You know as well as I do that the child of the mother who is on welfare will find it rather difficult to scrape up the few cents admission that they have to pay to admit him or her to whatever cultural function will be held in that place. There is something else that we must do, and this is a prime requisite before we direct our thoughts and our energies towards cultural enrichment of this community.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)....

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to read to you from a book written by a man - I don't know if he's a socialist but I doubt it very much - it has nihil obstat and imprimatur in it by a Catholic Priest from St. Francois Xavier University, Father Cody, and he has this to say: "The common man is capable of dipping into the cultural fields to a much greater extent than we have ever known. An outstanding modern educator in a recent work holds out great possibilities for the common man. He thinks for instance that the day is at hand when the ordinary man in a free democratic society could actually acquire a knowledge of modern languages, and of ancient languages too, and enjoy the rich content in the literature of all. If we look upon Latin and Greek as synonymous with the culture of the ancients, it may be possible to place even this at the disposal of the people. The art, literature and philosophy of the ancients are there. The job of all educators " - and he speaks of all people here, leaders in the community as educators - "is to give the mass man a chance to appreciate his rich heritage and to express himself." Remember that he is an easterner writing this - "he must build his lobster factories before he can erect his new Pantheon."

This is the opportunity I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that has to be given these people who are living on welfare in communities in northern Manitoba, in the Interlake area, in the downtown area of the City of Winnipeg. Continuing, "If we are at all realistic we will see to it that he has an opportunity to create the kind of society wherein man will be free to free his soul. If we are seriously interested in raising the cultural levels of the masses of men, we will help in solving the economic problem first so that they may cease to worry about bread and begin to enjoy their Brahms. With the economic question at least partly settled they will be at liberty to devote their time and energies to the more enjoyable cultural pursuits."

And I just wish to conclude with this, Mr. Chairman, that if this be the kind of society that we wish to build, then it is high time that the Department of Welfare do the job that it was charged with doing in co-ordinating the activities of the other departments in such a way that all the people of the Province of Manitoba will be able to benefit from the employment opportunities that there are in this province, from the educational opportunities that there are in this province and from the cultural benefits that the people here may have the privilege of enjoying.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there's not too much time left and I don't intend to speak at any length either. However, I would like to make a few comments in connection with the report and the estimates that we are dealing with at the present time. I notice that the costs of operating the Welfare Department in Manitoba will be up again some \$5 million. I don't know, is it that we have no control over this item or is it just going to stay on growing on us year after year? Certainly one would feel that there should be a limit somewhere and that the costs should not just grow and keep on growing.

The report is quite interesting and most likely I will have some further comments as we go on, but one matter that I thought I should discuss and ask for further advice on is the matter of the procedure that is followed in adoptions. I notice from the report here that through the adoption program some 607 cases were reported where you have adoptions taking place. This apparently is 88 more than the year previous and definitely this is an improvement. And also I note from the report that we have more adoptions taking place in rural Manitoba now than in the Greater Winnipeg area. I wonder if there's an explanation for this. Is it that the country people just go for this more or is there some background or some particular reason for this. Certainly I had a case referred to me the other day in connection with adoption and I am not too familiar with the procedure that is followed. I've had cases where letters were written to me for recommendation and so on, but still I would like to have a little more information on this whole deal.

I was about to congratulate the department. On Page 24 in connection with Table 8 in connection with births in Manitoba, we notice here the total births that are given for the years from 1961 to 1965 and also the illegitimate birth rate, and I find that the illegitimate birth rate among Indians is way way down. It is down from 490 to 109 and I was about to congratulate....

MR. CARROLL: It's a misprint.

MR. FROESE: Just the point I'm coming to. I was about to congratulate the Minister on this and then on adding them up I found that there was a mistake somewhere, so I wondered whether this was a misprint or whether the total was wrong.

MR. CARROLL: I'd like to have taken credit for that kind of reduction but I'm sorry I can't.

MR. FROESE: So I imagine I cannot therefore congratulate the government on this although I would definitely have liked to see a reduction in this case.

There is another matter that I would briefly question the Minister on and that is on the turnover of staff in his department, especially in connection with social workers. I happen to visit the department once in a while, not too often, and then almost every time I go in there I face a different worker having to deal with, and I'm just wondering is there a large turnover in the staff as far as social workers are concerned and how many of them do we employ? Is there also a shortage of these people, of these qualified people? Maybe he could also comment on this when he gives us an answer.

Then I noticed on Page 40 where we deal with the matter of housing units and hostels and so on and the various organizations throughout the province that have received assistance, and I notice some of the areas around my home area that have received substantial assistance. I think this program has worked quite well and I think this is one area where the government should receive credit.

I would like to know though, is there a waiting list in connection with applications for assistance for further construction of hostels and housing units, and if so, what does this amount to; are there more rural areas, more rural centres that are requesting help; and is this going to be a phasing-out program or will there be less applications and will there be less assistance required in the future. I think these are some of the questions I would like to get answered. I notice the Minister wants to call it a day so I will just close my remarks with that.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, before moving that the Committee rise, I wonder if I could take this opportunity to remind honourable members that the Law Amendments Committee meets tomorrow morning, Room 254 at 10:00 o'clock, and also I could use the occasion to remind honourable members that it is the intention that the House, by unanimous consent, will sit on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock until 12:30 and then sit again from 2:30 until approximately sometime around 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon before taking leave by train for The Pas. I just remind the honourable members that that is the --(Interjection)-- I'll tell my honourable friend after where he was. I take this occasion to remind honourable members that that is the proposed schedule for sitting on Thursday in order that we can all get away on the train which I am told leaves at 6:00 o'clock Thursday evening, so we'll try to get out of the House at about 5:00 o'clock Thursday evening and make up the loss of Thursday evening's sitting Thursday morning.

I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered a number of resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Member for Arthur, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the debate be adjourned. Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: I believe the motion was that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

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

MR. LYON: I beg to move, seconded by the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.