

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Thursday, February 16, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of Joy Huston and Others Praying for the Passing of an Act to Incorporate the Association of Occupational Therapists of Manitoba. The Petition of the Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants of Manitoba Praying for the Passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): introduced Bill No. 49 an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party): on behalf of Mr. Cherniack introduced Bill No. 54 an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of the Whole House.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General, with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed? Resolved that it be expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act by providing among other matters for the payment from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund of certain claims and amounts.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the money resolution that is referred to here refers essentially to two matters that will be brought before the House in the Bill. One has to do with the position of the owner of a car or the position of a person who is injured or suffers damage by reason of being run into by a car which is stolen. This is a clarification to the Act which is apparently required by virtue of a judgment of one of our Courts and will clarify that position and I think be more beneficial for people who find themselves in that circumstance. Another provision provides for the payment out of the Fund of certain specified amounts for driver education program; and a third matter which relates to the financial part of the Bill has to do with the registration of antique cars and exemptions that are provided thereby.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would refresh my memory at least on exactly what the provisions are now insofar as public liability coverage under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and property damage. I understand there is some problems in the property damage area. Now what are the limits at the moment. What will we cover?

MR. LYON: I would have to do that, Mr. Chairman, at second reading of the Bill. I don't have the full statute in front of me but we can go into that fully at second reading.

MR. MOLGAT: That would satisfy my purposes Mr. Chairman. If possible I wonder if the Minister could give us a mimeographed sheet giving us just the details of what the coverage is right now. My concern is that there may be areas that we should now be covering under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and which are not covered. I realize that we increased the limits some two years ago, I think, to \$35,000 and maybe this should be reviewed again while we're doing something with the Act, but certainly on the property damage end, I think there there's room for a review. So if he could supply us with that I'll be prepared to discuss it on second reading.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, isn't it correct that they don't pay anything for property damage? --(Interjection)--

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): It's in the Bill - the Statutes . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, but I was talking about the situation as it stands today. -- (Interjection)-- It pays property damage? I didn't recall.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I take it there is no change as far as claims. There still has to be a Court Order in order to get compensation in the claim.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just a word on this. I am going to abide pretty well by the rule and await the introduction of the Bill insofar as this unsatisfactory Unsatisfied Judgment Fund that we have in the Province of Manitoba at the time. I still affirm that it's an unsatisfactory situation in the Province of Manitoba. I hope that the whittling away at the Act by the Attorney-General will eventually convince him of the correctness of my statements and that we should not in Manitoba still insist on people who are covered by insurance paying into a fund annually on behalf of those who are not and are still permitted to drive vehicles on our highways. However, as I said Mr. Chairman, we will await with a great deal of interest the amendments that will be proposed insofar as this Bill is concerned, and I expect at that time we may have a comment or two to offer.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point that I have a certain reservation in respect to the principle involved in charging up driver education to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. Now it may be that when the Honourable Minister introduces his Bill that he'll expound on that principle more fully and I may accept it, but at the present moment I feel that it is wrong in principle to charge an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund with driver education. I think that should be charged out of provincial revenues.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if on second reading the Minister will be prepared to inform the House the amount of revenue that was produced from the \$25.00 fee in lieu of insurance. My guess is that it produced a substantial amount of money and probably the Fund is richer by reason of it. I'm not very happy with that arrangement but perhaps on second reading the honourable friend would have all the figures in respect to the financial position of the fund as of this date, broken down to show how the financial proceeds has been arrived at.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, we'll endeavour at second reading to take note of all of the questions that have been asked, most of which don't relate to the money portion of the Bill, and to obtain answers for the honourable members and deal, I hope satisfactorily, with the point raised by my honourable friend from Selkirk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted this resolution and instructed me to report the same.

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

MR. LYON introduced Bill 52 an Act to amend the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Labour concerning the Minimum Wage Board. I just wonder whether a report has been received or if there is any date on which the Minister anticipates a report will be received.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no" to both questions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture concerning the Vegetable Marketing Commission. Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that a large majority of the employees of this Commission have expressed their desire to be represented by a trade union and I just wonder whether the Minister would use his good offices to see that the Commission recognizes the right of collective bargaining and voluntarily enters into collective bargaining with these particular employees.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, we certainly recognize the rights of the employees at that organization to go into

(MR. ENNS, cont'd) any type of bargaining position they so choose.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the Commission will then undertake to begin bargaining collectively with the employees who have expressed their desire to belong to a trade union, namely the United Packinghouse Workers of America? -- and will commence collective bargaining with them just as if they were a certified bargaining agent?

MR. ENNS: I have no specific knowledge at this time, Mr. Speaker, as to just what the situation is there. I would just point out to the Honourable Member for Inkster that there is some question as to which organization the employees of the Commission would choose to be represented.

MR. GREEN: Do I understand the Minister to say that once . . . a supplementary question Mr. Speaker. Well this is No. 2.

Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Minister to suggest that once it is determined which organization these employees want to bargain on their behalf that normal collective bargaining will take place with that organization, and is he aware that approximately 42 or 45 of them applied to have United Packinghouse Workers bargain on their behalf.

MR. ENNS: I'll take that question as notice Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is the provincial government assisting farmers in trying to get their necessary registrations to get unemployment insurance for their workers? --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat the question, I'm asking the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture whether the provincial government is assisting farmers in getting their necessary registrations and so on in order to get unemployment insurance for their workers.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the ag representatives scattered throughout the provinces are receiving from the Canada Manpower centres literature and information with respect to the unemployment insurance and that in this way yes, we are assisting them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the great interest shown in the ill effects of the indiscriminate use of LSD, is the Minister of Health considering any legislation in this connection.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): The drug, Mr. Speaker, cannot be obtained in this province without the prescription of a doctor.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for St. George asked me a question about a judgment in one of our magistrates courts concerning the use of radar, I'm now told by the department that they have this matter under consideration and it is also being referred to the Department of Public Utilities for consideration.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health, a subsequent question to that asked by my honourable friend the Member for Emerson. I wasn't satisfied at all with the answer that I got from my honourable friend --(Interjection)-- Well the question is this that in Alberta they did introduce legislation just recently and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. SHOEMAKER: and why are we not concerned, why are we not concerned to the same extent and the same degree as the citizens of Alberta. Why are we not?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and we have it under control. We don't need legislation under our present methods of operating with it.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Has the government yet received the fourth annual report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board?

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate when he expects this report to be tabled, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not able to indicate that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The honourable . . .

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Might it be expected during the course of the session?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sure my honourable friend will get it in plenty of time to misquote it, as he has been doing in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) information for each fiscal year beginning April 1, 1963, up to and including the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1968:

1. The amount of grant made or estimated to be made by the Province of Manitoba to:
 - a) the Manitoba Committee on Alcohol Education and the government agency that has assumed the function formerly served by the Manitoba Committee on Alcohol Education
 - b) Alcohol Education Service
 - c) The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba
 - d) The Salvation Army Harbor Light Centre for Alcoholics
2. The amount of grant received or estimated to be received by the Province of Manitoba from the Government of Canada by agreement(s) under the Act re the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons and with respect to the work of
 - a) the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba
 - b) the Salvation Army Harbor Light Centre for Alcoholics
3. The basis on which the amount of annual grant to the several agencies mentioned above is determined, or the method by which the amount of grant is calculated for each; and whether and how the policy followed takes into account the amount of revenue obtained by the Province of Manitoba annually under the operations of the Liquor Control Act.
4. The amount of revenue derived or estimated to be derived by the Province of Manitoba under the operations of the Liquor Control Act.
5. Whether any changes in the method of calculating the grant or the basis on which it is determined have been made since 1953, and details of such changes

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I am asking for the information as outlined in the Order for Return is because it appeared to me in the eight years that I have been in the House that there is no relationship between the revenues received by the province on the sale of liquor and the contributions that they make to the various agencies. Just yesterday I went back to the estimates of 1937, 30 years ago, not for the purpose of the figures on liquor revenues but for another purpose. But I happened to notice that in that year, 30 years ago, the province received in revenue from liquor about a million dollars -- 30 years later, and in this year, according to the estimates, they expect to receive this year 23 million, 2 hundred dollars, or about 23 times as much as they did 30 years ago. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that people are not drinking 23 times as much liquor perhaps, although this government might drive more people to it, but no doubt the consumption has gone up and the tax has gone up and the price has gone up to the extent that we are now receiving 23 times as much revenue as we did 30 years ago. I don't know, I don't know the size of the grants to the various worthwhile organizations that I've listed here; I don't know what they were 30 years ago. My guess is that they were somewhere in the same size as they are today.

What I'm really concerned about is that -- and everybody recognizes this -- that there are many unfortunate individuals, men and women and teenagers in this day and age who have become alcoholics and all of us are or should be concerned about their welfare. And not only to their welfare but the welfare of their families and surely, surely it has long since been established that these organizations are doing a real job in this field of rehabilitation, and so on. I see my honourable friends laughing across the way as if they weren't doing a valuable service. Either they are or they're not and if they are, let's give them a helping hand. And every time that you see an alcoholic, let's give him a helping hand because it is a disease and it's a disease that is advancing over the years. We all admit that.

And so what I'm asking for is, is there a relationship between the revenues on the one hand and the contributions that the government are making to these organizations on the other; and if there isn't, let's see that there is. Let's set a policy that will say we will contribute 5 percent, 6 percent or 10 percent of our revenues to this whole field of rehabilitation. Let's establish a policy, because it's not good enough to say that there never has been one; that's not good enough. What we want to do is if there hasn't been one from this day forward and forevermore let's establish some kind of a policy that will relate the contributions to these various organizations to the revenues received from the sale of liquor.

Now the very fact -- and it was good news to hear that the House of Seagrams were setting up this \$10 million plant at Gimli -- but on the other hand, the very fact that it is there is an advertisement in itself for the sale of liquor, let's face it, and here again is one more reason I suggest that there should be some relationship and some policy in this regard.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. How much money has been allocated for Pan-American Games publicity?
2. How much money has been allocated for paid advertising (press, radio and television)?
3. How much money has been spent on paid advertising in the United States?
4. How much money will be spent altogether for advertising in the United States?
5. How much money will be spent in Minneapolis and Chicago?

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get your seconder.

MR. DOERN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that we do not have this information at our disposal. We cannot accept the question. It's information that has to be obtained from the Pan-American Games Society.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for advice here. I'm concerned about this question in regard to tourism. I don't know whether I can speak on this or whether it's entirely out of order. My point is simply this, that there are I believe thousands of Americans who will come to our province but I have some firsthand knowledge that the games at least in Chicago and so on apparently are not very well publicized.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the honourable member's feelings and his opinion but in view of the First Minister's reply to the effect that he could not provide the information, would that be acceptable?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, actually I believe the First Minister jumped up a little ahead of time. It's normal as I understand it from past experience that a member who is introducing an Order for Return has the first opportunity to present the Order for Return and briefly make a remark and then if in the opinion of the government or it is not acceptable then that is done after that time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Elmwood proceed.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll make my remarks short. I realize that the government does not tell the Pan-American games where to spend its money or does not allocate for specific purposes. But my point is this, the Provincial Government has donated a considerable amount of money to the Pan-American games and I believe from what information I have that they are spending an inadequate amount on advertising in the northern United States. They have their own budget and their own problems, I mean I just feel, from what sources I don't know, that they may require additional funds for publicity. So my point is that in a Chicago area and in a Minneapolis area, the amount of money I understand they're spending is completely inadequate, it's only a token amount. I think we can attract thousands and thousands of people from the northern states and I understand that we're going to do this on the basis of free publicity. I don't think that's good enough.

They have a small budget for publicity and I just wonder whether it's adequate because we can really bring them in. I think the Minister in charge of tourism should be concerned about this. We have a tremendous drawing card and I'm concerned that we're just going to sort of blow the whole thing by not properly advertising it.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have any right to make any remark because I've interpreted the honourable gentleman closed the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: No he didn't actually introduce

MR. ROBLIN: Oh I see, well if I am allowed to speak I would simply say that I sympathize with the point the honourable member makes and I believe that when the Department of Tourism and Recreation comes up there will be an opportunity to discuss what the government is doing about the Pan-American games. But the question asks for some information as to what the Pan-American Games Association are doing. That you must apply to Mr. Culver Riley for if you want the answer. It is not available here. So we can't accept the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, are you not putting the matter to a vote?

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps if the honourable gentleman would like to withdraw it it would dispose of the matter.

MR. DOERN: Well Mr. Speaker, in view of the Honourable First Minister's explanation, I'll withdraw the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. A. The total Assessment
- B. The equalized Assessment, and
- C. The balanced Assessment

for each of the school divisions in Manitoba for the years 1965, 1966 and 1967.

2. The amount of money the Province is receiving under the general levy from each division, and the mill rate applied for that purpose in each case of the above categories and for the same years.

3. The number of teachers employed and the amount paid out in teacher grants to each division for the years 1965 and 1966.

4. The amount each division would receive under the New Foundation Plan for 1967 in teacher grants, providing the same teachers were employed and stayed on another year.

5. The amount of school tax rebate paid to taxpayers in total for each Division, per year, for the time the rebate has been in effect.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in asking for this Order for Return, I think it is essential that we as members have this information before us. I certainly can't go on a platform not having the information when it is being asked for and certainly the people in this province will be asking for it. I am sure that all the other members of this House will of necessity require that information. I think we have to have these figures in order to compare just what is the situation. Is it really beneficial to a given division and to what extent. I think this is a matter of information that we have to have and it's not just superficial that I'm asking for this.

I do not refer here for a differentiation between the commercial property and the other property. I am sure this would probably be of interest to some members. It doesn't particularly concern me in my area. If other members are requiring this information, certainly they would have a right to amend it in any form they require. Then too, the amount of tax rebate. We know that where the Foundation Program will not be voted in, the tax rebate will still be applicable and I for one, would like to know how much in the way of tax rebates have been paid to these divisions and to what extent the division would be affected. So I hope the government sees fit to accord me the information that I am asking for.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, we accept this order for return insofar as we are able to answer the questions and give this information. For example, the equalized assessment is not finalized in many cases for last year. Under No. 2, we don't receive any general levy from each division. No. 3 we don't break down teacher grants. No. 4 we don't hire teachers. But insofar as we can find information on this to give to the honourable member we shall.

MR. MOLGAT: Was the honourable member going to ask a question or was he going to close the debate?

MR. FROESE: Well I was both, asking questions and also going

MR. MOLGAT: Well if the honourable member is going to close the debate, then Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak at this time. I would be very curious to know from the Minister exactly what information he is prepared to supply because gathering from his statements, there would be very little of this coming out. He said for example on question 2, the province doesn't receive any money under general levy. Well I think that is correct, but I think maybe it's simply the way the question was worded, I think the intention of the honourable member is how much does the general levy raise and while it is true that it doesn't come into provincial funds, it is one of the calculations insofar as establishing what the local taxation is. So I would hope that the Minister won't simply hide behind wording in providing the information, because I think that the questions that are posed here are really vital to the vote that is going to be held on the 10th of March. It's a question that people have every reason for asking at these meetings. Certainly the ones that I get frequently from people across the province is "what does this mean exactly in dollars and cents to us."

Well I was surprised last night to see in the Winnipeg Free Press a statement referring to the City School Budget, saying that the Winnipeg School Board gave its approval to a \$27 million budget, and then further down in the story it says, that they can't tell what this is going to mean to taxes because much of the total cost is expected to be met through the government's new Foundation Program -- and this is the important part it seems to me, and I quote directly from the newspaper: "But, the Provincial Department of Education hasn't yet figured out the

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) details of the new financing formula, so no estimate is available on how much the province will pay the Winnipeg Board or any other Board in Manitoba."

Well if this is so, Mr. Speaker, then I think it is high time that my honourable friends do advise the boards what they are going to pay, because how else can the people make a sensible decision. My friends can say, and I agree, that insofar as the quality of education that no doubt you can give better education in a graded school, but the cost questions are still in the minds of many people and unless we satisfy them on that score, the danger is that they may be by fear, not turn out to vote or vote against.

My honourable friends have been very critical of Ottawa for not supplying them with the information as to what their education grants are going to be. We heard the Provincial Treasurer again yesterday telling the House once more that he can't determine what it means in Manitoba's terms, because Ottawa hasn't made clear to Manitoba or the other provinces what money they are going to pay out on education. He said they haven't got the details. Well are we faced here with the same situation, where we are asking the people of Manitoba on the 10th of March to proceed with a vote and we are not able to tell them exactly what the situation is? So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister will provide this information in the intent in which it is asked here, and in fact, in greater amount if possible, than what the Honourable Member for Rhineland is asking, so that we can clarify the situation for the people of the Province and we don't end up with a situation described here for the City of Winnipeg.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to support the Honourable Member for Rhineland in general in the information that he seeks. From what I gathered from the Honourable the Minister of Education, there is not much of this Order for Return that he appears to accept. Ah, but Mr. Speaker my honourable friend says we don't have it. Is this so? I can appreciate that there is, insofar as item No. 2 is concerned, improper phrasing of the question, but I think this is understandable, we know that the province doesn't receive money under the general levy, but we do know the amount of money that is raised within each school division surely by way of the general levy and that information I am sure is available and what the mill rate is.

No. 3. The number of teachers employed and the amount paid out in teacher grants to each division for '65 and '66. Surely to goodness the Minister of Education or his department is aware of the number of teachers in each school division and the sum total of the amounts payable for teacher grants. This information surely must be available.

No. 4. The amount each division would receive under the new Foundation plan for 67 in teacher grants, providing the same teachers were employed and stayed on another year. Now I think this is quite understandable. All you have to do is to transpose the teacher grants under the present formula to that which it would be if a school division adopted the single area administration plan.

This is the type of information, Mr. Speaker, that our honourable friend the Minister of Education suggested would be made available to us as information when we are meeting the people in our respective divisions and surely to goodness -- I often use the phrase in this House, and outside of buying a pig in a poke -- now this surely, Mr. Speaker, isn't going to be the attitude of the approach to the electorate insofar as the single school division; because how in creation's name, Mr. Speaker, are the ratepayers going to be able unless they have this type of information, the comparison of teacher grants under the present system with that under the proposed system - how can they intelligently compare what they are going to receive under the two systems of grants. I think this is vital and I'm sure in my own mind, that the Minister of Education could speak to some of his experts in the department and receive this financial information.

The only one really that I have any question about as to the possible availability is No. 5. That's dealing with the tax rebate, which would be on a municipal basis because it goes through the municipal offices and it might be very time consuming to have that broken down into the different school boundaries because the school boundaries are not coterminous with those of the municipalities. So I can see some difficulty here and while it could be eventually figured out, possibly it would take a long time to really break it down into that basis and I would suggest in all due respect to my friend, although I can appreciate the reasons why he is endeavouring to get this information, with the time element concerned, we wouldn't get the information long after the referendum may be held.

But I want to appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister to take another look at his statement of the non-availability of the information sought by the Member for Rhineland. In my opinion

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd this is vital information that we should have in our hands to go and fight the good fight, the establishment of the single school division. Now I want it -- no, I guess I shouldn't impute motives to my friend -- I want to be able to sell the single school division plan. I leave it at that. The information can help me sell the plan and I guess it might be possible the information might be able to defeat the plan. But let's have it.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have some question in my mind about this system of debate that has grown up this session on Orders for Returns because I think members will find that in the mother of parliament this kind of thing is not allowed because it converts the item of private business, which this really is, into a debatable item which takes up a good deal of our time and thus does not sort of fit in with the regular business of proceeding with government business, and what they do there, is that if members wish to debate it, which of course is quite understandable, then it takes another position on the order paper and I think that sometime we should look into that.

But that's not my purpose in speaking. I really want to help my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP in his effort to help us with this divisional plan, single district division plan, and point out to him that this question of finance is really not quite so troublesome as some members seem to think, because we know that a 9 mill standard uniform levy will be charged across the province on residential and farm property and a standard uniform levy of 33 mills will be charged across the province as a standard uniform levy. So if anyone inquires as to what the local tax rate will be, that's the first piece of information that can be given to them.

Now will they pay any other tax? That's the next question that's germane, and the answer is: that depends. And it depends on two things. It depends on the Foundation Program, and we are working hard to finalize that, but it also depends on the budget adopted by the local school board over which we have no control and no knowledge. So that really nobody, I think, should go into this referendum trying to say in any categorical language to the voters that your school tax will be thus and thus. We can say that it will be 9 and 33 plus the special levy. And I hope members will make it clear that it will be 9 and 33 for this year only. We have no

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): On the equalized assessment.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you. On the equalized assessment. I hope that no one will indicate to the voters that it's going to stay at 9 and 33 because no one can give any guarantee about that. I think one can, if one is asked about the general levy, and of course as I said on the special levy and that depends on the two factors that I've mentioned, one of which of course we have nothing to do with, I think one can say that as a rough guesstimate of the situation today that in rural Manitoba the special levy will be from nothing to perhaps 3 mills -- My colleague says 5. There may be some areas in which it is 5 -- and that in the Metropolitan area it will probably range from 6 mills perhaps to as high as 14 or 15 in one of the Metropolitan divisions. But until we know the budgets of the school divisions it's not possible to say what the special levy is going to be.

So while we will get the information as far as it is available to us, that the member requests -- and I only hope we can get it in time for his purposes because some of the detail here is going to take some digging out. We'll do our best to dig it out and get it for him -- I do not want members to be under any misapprehension of what the nature of the financial situation is that we should present to the electorate. We can tell them clearly that it's 9 and 33 to pay for the Foundation Program which is a \$95 million program, \$5 million more than the entire special and general levies last year. So it's a fairly generous program. The special levy is on top of that and that will be governed not just by what the government does but what the local school division board does, and until we know what the local school division board does no one can say with any certainty what that special levy is going to be. We can give them an order of magnitude, I've indicated them to you now, and my only purpose in speaking was to try and make it clear that as far as I understand the question at any rate that members could adopt the approach that I have suggested dealing with the finances, but if anyone tries to sell this on the basis that it's a saving or an expense or anything else, I wish they wouldn't bother. Sell it on what it does for the child. Sell it on the quality of education. If you can sell it on those principles then I think the financial effects follow. My experience with the people of Manitoba is that if you can convince them that it's a good thing for the child that they'll pay the bill.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, when the White Paper was introduced to the House I said very much the same as my honourable friend the First Minister said. I said, "Let's tell the people the facts and if it's a better plan, let's tell them it's a better plan and let's tell them that it's going to cost them a little more money." This time let's be frank; let's not make some of the mistakes that were made ten years ago, when my honourable friends concurred in my comments at that time. And like my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party said that most of us intend to go out and try and sell the plan, but you can't sell a pig trough if you don't know what the cost is going to be or the product that you have. You've got to know; you've got to know your product and you've got to be able to tell them pretty well what the cost is going to be. And as I attempted to get some information the other day from my honourable friend before the Orders of the Day and I failed to get them to my satisfaction, and that had to do with the mill rate.

Now my honourable friend the First Minister has said and dealt at some length on the 9 mills and the 33 mills as paying for the Foundation. But it appears to me that it will not in fact be 9 mills in most of the rural municipalities. There have been towns, yes -- if I interpret the figures correctly, it would look to me as if in Neepawa it would be 9 mills or very, very close. But as I explained the other day I obtained from the Department the new statement of equalized assessments for 1967 of all municipalities in the province and in many, many cases the assessments are up 40 - 50 percent -- equalized assessment -- over what they were. And so if you are relating the 9 mills to last year's equalized assessment, to last year's equalized assessment, then in consideration of the fact that the '67 equalized assessment is up it appears that it might be 11 mills or 12 mills or something of this kind. Now, as I said before, I think we might as well be fair and tell the people if you're speaking in someplace that, "Listen, here is what it is likely going to be, because it will likely be in your case, 11 mills or 11.9 or something of this kind," and I think the people will buy it if you tell them this, but if you tell them it's going to be 9 and they get their tax notice and it's 12 well then they're going to be mad --(Interjection)-- That's right, but the people do not understand this, but if we had a formula, as I tried to point out the other day, can we take the 1967 over the '66 times 9 and say here's what it will be? If we'll just have something of this kind then we'll know exactly where we're at. So I think much of the information that my honourable friend is asking for would be helpful if we could get it before the -- well in the next ten days. And I hope that we will because, as I said before, it will make it easier for us to answer some of the questions that are put to us at these various meetings if we have the information that we must have to give an intelligent kind of an answer.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, if you will recall when the White Paper came down I made some remarks in regards to the equalized assessment and actual and I could foresee the confusion that was going to arise in the minds of people in regards to this particular question. As a matter of interest I purposely worked out one division and the 9 mill basic on the equalized assessment works out anywhere from 10 to 14 mills in the one division, depending on which municipality you may be in, and on the revenue bearing property, it works out anywhere from 35 mills to 49 mills without any special tax. So you can see the confusing items that you're going to have to answer out in the territory in regards to these questions of the people that are primarily interested in, "What are my taxes going to be?" So again you get back to various suggestions and criticism.

If the White Paper had said we had a basic mill rate right across the board I think we would have eliminated a lot of the possible opposition on cost. I have reference to one rural municipality that has 9 elevators and their tax last year was 31 mills. This year it's going to be 49 without any special. So you can see the arguments and particularly when you get these type of concerns, particularly the co-operatives mixed up with people that are shareholders and dividend. So I think it's primarily essential that people going out into the field are absolutely sure that they're telling that this 9 mills and 33 is just a starting point. This has got to be worked out and to be sure that you're telling the people the exact truth you would have to go to the municipal office and get it worked out at that particular time at that meeting, so that the people can be informed intelligently as to what the cost will be, because primarily there are going to be people at these meetings that are going to say, "What's it going to cost us?"

Personally my intent is that I would like to see this information given on this Order, but from my point of view any meetings I am going to attend, I'm going to get this information from the municipality so that I can tell the people exactly what it's going to be on this basis of the uniform return for the Foundation Program.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that some of the members at least are in the position that I am that I've already attended one of these meetings. I'm sure that I'm not the only one here who has already attended one of these meetings. I was invited to one and I have been there and I have heard the discussion that takes place and I have heard the questions that are asked and I have noted with interest and approval, the fact that the folks who came to that meeting were quite well informed and they certainly knew the searching questions to ask and they gave information in many cases. One of the points of information that they gave -- this meeting happened to be very close to the boundary line to two different municipalities and very close to the boundary line of two different districts as they presently exist and so there were these complicating features that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain speaks of. And it was agreed there that, generally speaking, the equalized assessment is approximately, in the municipality where the meeting was held, approximately one-third higher than the actual assessment which meant that immediately the people there were dealing with a 12 mill figure rather than a 9. But they were asking many questions dealing with administration and with such practical questions as the costs that would be incurred and the allowances that would be made by the department or the central fund for such things as transportation, and was transportation compulsory. Many questions there were raised that couldn't be completely answered by the people who attended the meeting, including myself, and one of the points that was raised very specifically, as is always the case I think in the rural districts, is what will happen to our local schools. And this is the key question in a lot of these areas. The most of people, not all, but the most of people are inclined to concede that likely on the pure basis of academic standing alone that the proposed scheme is beneficial, but they raise the other issues of what will this do to our community, where will the schools be located and there was a good deal of discussion at this meeting over what a lot of people esteem to be sort of a bureaucratic board that was established or was indicated in the White Paper and they were already well enough -- several of the people at that meeting were already well enough acquainted with the White Paper to point out in no uncertain terms that public school finance board that is to be created will have control of capital expenditures including expenditures for school buses and school buildings, and so the question was raised there most definitely.

Well even if you concede the fact that this larger division board may be inclined to protect what we feel to be the local community interest in recognizing the requirements of this area for a school, that under Clause (f) of the public school finance board that this board could veto the decision that the district board makes. Now it seems to me that that's a most important consideration and I think that somebody must be in a position to either confirm or deny that. Personally on reading the White Paper I am of the opinion that the person who makes that statement is correct because that's the way I read the responsibilities or the powers of the public school finance board.

So I think that the information that's asked for here is most pertinent, in fact it's absolutely necessary and I've been talking to my desk mate here the honourable member for Selkirk who suggests to me that inasmuch as there's urgency of getting this information as fully as was asked for and perhaps in some more proper form, that he is inclined to suggest the adjournment of the debate so that he and the Minister and the sponsor of this resolution might get together and work out some method of providing the fullest information that we can at the earliest possible moment.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak on this Order, I'm going to ask the House a question through you. Would the House be agreeable to giving unanimous consent to this matter being held until this afternoon and then given first priority? In the interval it is my thought that the Minister and I and the honourable mover of the resolution get together and reduce it to an acceptable form.

MR. LYON: Speaking to the point of order, it is the intention of the government to, as the next item of business, to ask you, Sir, to call the second readings of Bills Nos. 17, 24, 26 and 27, leaving out the third readings at the request of the Member for Rhineland and then to move into Supply and presumably to stay in Supply for the rest of the afternoon until we adjourn sometime around 4:30 or quarter to five. So the procedure that is suggested by my honourable friend really wouldn't fit into those plans too well. Subject to the comments of the Minister of Education on the question or on the point of order that my honourable friend's raising, I myself can't see any great advantage. If information is sought and information is

(MR. LYON, cont'd) wanted in a hurry then I suggest the best thing to do is get along with passing the order and not debating it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take too much of the time up here but I too have attended two meetings on the formation of the single school districts and I gave my full support to it, tried my best to answer questions and so on, but there's so many questions that were asked at these meetings that I could not explain and neither could some of the speakers who were sent or who were invited to speak at this meeting.

The White Paper enunciates the principle of the new Foundation Plan and it seems to me that if the honourable minister would speed up the introduction of the Bill in connection with this -- we are waiting, we've asked several times when will the Bill be presented -- I think it would clarify a lot of this misunderstanding and controversy that we are discussing at the present time. I for one just can't reconcile this haste at the present time, crash program or whatever you may call it. You remember that I complained about this when the boundaries or the school divisions were first instituted, that it was more or less a hurry up and a crash program. I would like this to be accepted immediately but it seems that we are doing exactly the same thing; here we find that the government, in my opinion, is caught with - well, I won't say that - I'll say was caught unprepared again, because surely after nine years, almost nine years since this promise was given, "equal opportunity to every child," this government should have had enough time to study this thoroughly and should have had this Bill prepared beforehand. That we would have had the Bill before us, we could have studied it and then when a week from now when we're free to go out among the people, we'd know where we stand. And I would really ask the Minister to have that Bill before us this next week. In that way we will have a total package; otherwise at the present time we don't know where we're heading. I cannot see why it took the government that long to formulate a plan like this.

I agree with this plan and I support it, but I do not think that this should have been such a big job for the government because really there isn't so very much difference between this plan - the Foundation Plan - and the form of the Dauphin-Ochre plan. I think we've had a plan similar to this, the Dauphin-Ochre has been in existence for many years. Truly this is enlarged and this plan is financed probably a little different, but it's on the same principle, so the government had plenty of time to present us with the Bill and I would say that if the Minister would present his Bill very shortly we would know where we're going and there wouldn't be so much discussion on that.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Sir, if you'd be good enough now to leave the item on Committee of the Whole House and move down to the second readings of Bills 17, 24, 26 and 27 and thereafter then call the Committee of Supply, Sir, if you would.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I have the item stand.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Minister, might we have this matter stand.

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 26, an Act to amend the Agricultural Credit Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there are three changes that we're contemplating in the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. The first one being that in the event that a borrower makes an initial loan and then some years later comes back and takes out a substantially larger loan or another loan, that the balance owing be allowed to be amortized over the full 31 years. As it stands at the moment, the Act, by statute he is bound to pay back the total amount from the initial date that a loan was made. This in many instances creates quite a hardship because very often the pattern of the loans are such that the initial loan sometimes will be a small loan, the larger loan being the supplementary loan.

(MR. ENNS, cont'd)

Then also in Part 2 of the Act, and this is a portion of the Act that is being used more and more in the loaning of money on chattel mortgages to cattle. We have specifically, by statute, made this possible for beef herds. The suggestion is, or our request is, that we just simply delete the word "beef" and make it available to cattle owners of all kinds - we have of course in mind the dairy industry and so forth. We also hope to enlarge Part 2 of the Agricultural Credit Act in making chattel mortgages available for the purposes of purchasing breeding stock and other purposes of improving the facilities such as construction of milk houses, purchases of bulk tanks, improvement of pastures - any improvements of that kind in a farm scene.

The third change is a relatively minor one, Mr. Speaker. It's a question of identification. Again by statute the present Act is specific, it has to be either by brand or by tattoo in the case of registered animals or purebred animals. In many instances, particularly where more chattel mortgages are given to dairy cattle where brands are not used, the corporation is simply asking for a wider latitude in using any means of identification that they choose. They very often use their own ear tags or sometimes the Bang's or Brucellosis tags that are on the cattle at the time. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the three changes contemplated in the Act.

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

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the significant changes here are firstly a minor one, that is simply to, as we now have total provincial coverage there is no further need for special test areas and the proposal is to delete this from the title of the Act rather than have it called the "Test," have that word in the title, we just propose to call it the Manitoba Crop Insurance Act.

Secondly, we are asking to have our own Manitoba legislation fall in line with that of the federal enabling legislation with respect to products or crops covered. At the moment our own legislation covers wheat, oats, barley, flax and sugar beets. The federal legislation also includes some of the special crops of rape seed, mustard, peas, fall rye, potatoes, sunflowers and grain corn. It is our proposal that we include these further crops because it is of course the intention of the corporation when data becomes available, to include these in our own crop insurance. There is also a request that it helps the crop insurance corporation gather data and information on these crops from the different sources, federal sources or private sources if these persons know that it is our intention, it is in our Act that these crops will in time be covered.

The third change in the Act relates to the setting of the established price and current price. At the moment it's done by statute here in the House and it's been an awkward arrangement for the corporation to the extent that very often the current price or the established price cannot be set until the end of winter or early spring, thus very often a reflection, particularly a favorable reflection if the final prices are approved, these can't be incorporated in the current crop or the current insurable year to our farmers but have to await the next session of the Legislature whereby these prices can be set by statute. This is the main consideration here. Also, with respect to the new crops that I already mentioned that are going to become insurable as time goes by, again the Crop Insurance Corporation would like to be in a position of making this insurance, or this coverage, available to them just as soon as the data is there, and thereby ask that the setting of an established price, a current price, be permitted -- possibly to be done by regulation. By leaving it within the statutes again we would have to in some instances wait perhaps a full year prior to -- and bringing it to the Legislature to establish the current price, or the established price, that the coverage is based on.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I rise not to oppose the bill but I would like to get some further information. I wonder if the members could be provided with a schedule of the fees that they will be charging for these special crops and also the valuation of these crops that would be considered as probably practical in case of damages or losses this year. I know the Minister said that prices had not been established, but if we took the prices that had been in effect for the last number of years - surely there must be a record somewhere - maybe he could give us some information on this so that we would at least have an idea what we are speaking of and in what terms we are speaking of when we speak of indemnifying growers of

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) corn, sunflowers and so on. I think this would be valuable and if this could be provided I would certainly appreciate it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I really feel that if . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . closing the debate? Well I just wanted to make a comment or two in respect to the explanatory notes 6 and 7. I'm not quite clear on what the amendments purport to do. Now as I understand hail insurance and the insurable value, that is, it doesn't seem to be absolutely necessary for a farmer to establish the fact that he has a crop that is worth what he has insured it for, if you get what I'm driving at. I have been doing some hail adjusting for 14 years and this seemed to be a weakness of the policy. That is, a farmer could put four policies on at \$20.00 an acre so he would have insured a crop for \$80.00 per acre, and on examination of it, it became quite evident that he never did have a crop that was worth that kind of money - probably worth half of that. Now, how does the Manitoba Crop Insurance Act, or the corporation, establish the fact that he is insuring a crop that is worth what he insures it for? How is this established? Or does this -- do the amendments set out here regulate this aspect of it?

Take any given area in the province of Manitoba - we'll say an area where you allow a farmer to insure for \$20.00 an acre or \$25.00 an acre. How do you know that if there was no hazard or peril at all that he did, in fact, sow a crop that would produce that value? This is one of the points that I would like clarified. Perhaps this is intended, the amendments are intended to correct this situation. Now, it isn't a difficult thing to establish what any given crop will produce in bushels by measuring the distance per hundred plants and the distance between the rows, times the number of kernels per head. I mean, there is a formula for doing this and you can arrive at what it will produce once it's headed out, so I'll allow my honourable friend to answer this particular question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have only one point that I wanted to deal with, and that briefly. I listened with interest to the Honourable the Minister mentioning the changes being made in the method of fixing the established price. Honourable members who have been here for awhile will realize that I have usually objected to such matters being put in by regulation rather than being put in the statute. I hold to the view that, other things being equal, it is much preferable that the statute itself contain the maximum information about any plan or project or law and that the regulation should be kept to a minimum, and I must say that as a general principle I certainly will support that view. My honourable friend says that there is some matter of administration and I'm prepared to waive that principle to have a little more full discussion at the committee stage as to just what is contemplated here, and if it's really a matter of administration and if it's a fact, as I gathered my honourable friend the Minister to indicate, that this will work to the advantage of the insured, then I'd be inclined to take a more charitable view toward the change.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ENNS: I could perhaps, Mr. Speaker, just answer briefly to the questions put to me. With respect to the questions from the member for Rhineland; I think, while it's fairly easy to look at the figures of the value of production of some of these special crops as they now are, but if of course we had actuarial figures that we would be prepared to accept them insure on, they would be hopefully insured very shortly. It's these kind of figures that we don't have. These are and would be, of course, available to the farming community and all those interested as soon as they become available. I just ask him to appreciate the difference between the two. In some of these areas when we are trying to vote for a five - or 10-year average production, some of the special crops that are mentioned don't necessarily have that history of growth in this area, or at least not wide enough growth in this area.

The question from the Honourable Member from Gladstone with respect to how do we differentiate between what a farmer might have produced and what a crop could have produced, I can only point out that the insurance as such, we are selling a specific bushel coverage at an established price for a premium. The different management abilities, the different crops that can be produced, I would have to suggest, are pretty difficult from an administrative point of view to impute or to reflect the premiums. The policy - and this is no change; no regulations are changing this - we are selling a bushel coverage at an established price for a premium and it's entirely up to how the crop measures up to this that the recipient receives or does not receive any coverage.

I appreciate the Honourable Member from Lakeside's comments with respect to his questions as to necessity of moving any portions of any Act out of the area of statute in this

(MR. ENNS cont'd)....Legislature into the realm of regulations. I would find very little to quarrel with that. However, I am told by the crop insurance people that this is administratively advisable and I think that we would have no differences in the sense that it's my understanding thatand I would like to think that particularly with the present buoyant situation of our grain economy that we should be endeavouring to be in a position to reflect any rise in prices immediately or in that same insurable year to the farmers. Thank you.

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

.....continued on next page.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the 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

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I believe I should take this opportunity to reply to some of the early questions that have been put. I regret that the Member for Rhineland had to leave. I undertook to deal with his questions first in order that he might get the answer directly. However, I will reply now and it will be easy for him to find in Hansard when he returns.

The main burden of his complaint was that welfare costs were continuing to rise, and the question he asked was, was there no way in which these costs could somehow or other be controlled by the Department of Welfare. I think the answer is very simple as to why costs are going up. Costs are going up because we have more elderly people today than we have ever had before. They are living much longer and of course they require higher cost care in the remaining years of their life, particularly for health and care services of one kind or another. We have more child welfare problems and more families without a father, so that we have more people who rely exclusively on support from either their friends or relatives or, failing that, the province or the municipality. We have more physically and mentally disabled than we have ever had before, and part of this cost of course is the fact that we are developing new procedures of treating people outside of institutions, in many cases, who at one time were looked after in these establishments. I think the same trend exists not only in British Columbia and Alberta but in Canada and United States as well. This is a trend that is nation-wide and is occurring in all areas where we are developing into an industrial and urban society.

The Member for Rhineland is back in his seat now. He was asking about adoption procedures, and in principle the aim of the department is to obtain the best home, and by that I don't mean the most lavish or luxurious home; I mean the best home in terms of parents and environment of that kind; the best home possible for a child for whom we have the responsibility; home that can provide love and care, provide security for the child, provide for his physical needs to ensure that he grows up and has every opportunity to develop into a normal citizen in our society. Anyone who is interested in obtaining a child may apply. Their home will be studied no matter what part of Manitoba they live in. There are at least three interviews that are laid on by the department to try to ascertain a great deal of information about the family, such things as: can the family in fact accept an adopted child? And this is one of the real impediments to an adoption procedure, where one or other of the parents for their own reasons are not able to accept an adopted child into their family. They are investigated to see what kind of people they are, whether this is the kind of place where we would want to place a child who is our responsibility, whether it's the kind of home that is the best that's available for that particular child.

If no home is readily available within the jurisdiction of the Children's Aid Society involved, or the Director of Child Welfare, then we regularly exchange information with other Societies and with other agencies involved. This happens on a once-a-month basis and the hard-to-place children are the subject of a conference every three months. Unfortunately, we have a great many children who are what we describe as hard-to-place. Children of mixed race fit into this category: Indian children, Negro, Chinese, Japanese, West Indian and many others. There are many people who find that they cannot accept the child of a different racial background as part of their family. We have also the physically handicapped child or the child that is physically unattractive to adopting parents. The kind of handicaps that provide difficulties are deformities of various kinds, blind, spastic, children with speaking impediments and things of this kind. We try as best we can to remove the financial burden of a handicapped child and will sometimes extend our period of support for a year or two after adoption has been proceeded where there are substantial medical costs involved.

And for those children that are hard to place and others, I'd like to just say a word of appreciation to the foster parents in the Province of Manitoba who are doing a tremendous job

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... to look after these children on a temporary basis and providing them with the kind of home life that we would like to see for the children who are placed in our care and who have no adoption home available at the time of placement.

The Member for Rhineland was also very interested in our Elderly Persons Housing Act. He was interested in the grants that are available. The grants are all statutory. For single housing units I think it is either \$1,700 or \$1,750 per unit with \$2,100 for double units; hostels, \$1,700; personal care homes, a provincial grant of \$2,000 per unit. He wondered whether we were proceeding to phase out this program, and I say no, we're proceeding with the program; we are having very great difficulty in keeping up with the demand. We've certainly had excellent response from the sponsoring organizations and I would like to say that we're building elderly persons' housing in Manitoba at the rate of between \$3 million and \$4 million per year at the present time.

There were one or two other questions, questions of the difficulty in obtaining trained workers, the high rate of turnover and things of that kind. I would like to say that all government departments have difficulty in getting and keeping the kind of trained staff we need these days. I think that we're much better off today than we've ever been in the past and I think we're substantially better off than many other jurisdictions who are in the welfare field. It is true that many of our trained workers, particularly, are young ladies who marry, quite often shortly after taking up a position in the department. Fortunately many of them return in future years to strengthen our service and to use the professional training that they have.

Now, the Member for Gladstone was very concerned about a letter that he wrote me on the 8th of February and he hadn't had a reply by the 13th. Unfortunately I still don't have a reply for him but he will understand that it takes some time to get the kind of information that we need in order to reply to a letter where he asks why, in fact, an individual case was turned down. I have no specific knowledge of all of the applications that come into the department and therefore must seek the advice of those who have dealt with it and ask their judgment as to why individual cases are turned down. I think the main burden of his complaint is, however, that we're not paying enough; and of course he dragged out some outdated budgets to try to bolster his case and prove that in fact we were not paying enough. And I would hope that he and his friends will support our increases that have gone through and will speak in favour of them. However, I have reason to believe that all members of that Party don't support increased welfare allowances. In fact, I overheard the Member for St. Boniface just a few days ago voicing some chagrin at the allowance that is paid to people on provincial assistance. I think the Member for Portage la Prairie has on many occasions made public statements about the costs of welfare in the Province of Manitoba. Surely he doesn't support the view that our scale of grants is too low or else he might not have been making these statements.

The question of welfare costs in municipalities - I think that a very substantial burden was removed from municipalities when the Social Allowances Act came into effect in 1959 and had its effect in 1960. Unfortunately, all costs of providing services even with a smaller case load are going up, and for the first two or three years under the Social Allowances Act, when it wasn't fully proclaimed there were increases in total to the costs of municipal welfare assistance. However, I think the Member for Gladstone will find that the total, the general picture, has shown a decrease in municipal welfare costs over the last three years with a fairly substantial decrease in the estimates that are before the House, so that there is a very substantial reduction or a substantial removal of responsibility from municipalities, contrary to what was suggested by the Member for Gladstone. He wondered why the costs were going up \$5 million this year. I think the explanation is fairly simple, partly the explanation I gave to the Member for Rhineland that our elderly are costing us almost a million dollars more during the year ahead, a large part of this for institutional care. Our Mothers' Allowance case load will be going up this year with the assuming of larger responsibilities, extended responsibilities in this field, by about \$1,500,000 this year. The cost of relief among unorganized territories, the Local Government Districts, is up \$72,000. Non-residents are up by \$173,000. And another very large increase is in the Medicare program that's offered to people on social allowances; it's up by \$1.8 million during the year ahead. These figures do take into account the change in status for many of our elderly citizens as a result of the guaranteed income program as well as the changes in social allowance budgets that will be in effect at the first of our fiscal year.

I was very interested in the comments of the Member for Gladstone when he talked about the expert in welfare who had just quit our Portage office and who has taken up responsibilities

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)..... with Canada Manpower, and I'd like to just refer to three sentences to illustrate the thinking of the Member for Gladstone. He's not going to mention any names but he goes on to say that "the former social worker who for seven or eight years I guess was with the department at Portage." And here he expresses some uncertainty as to how long the gentleman was a member of our department. He goes on in the next sentence to say, "Here is a man with eight years' experience." - no doubt with this statement - "who was an expert in his field." Then he skips one sentence and goes on, "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."

Well, I just comment on that because it just goes to show how grossly inaccurate many of the statements are that are made in this House by people who want to misrepresent situations. The particular individual was a good employee. That's the first thing I want to say for him. He was a Bachelor of Arts; he had good public relations or many very good things about him that were commented on. He was hired by the department, as many other graduates are, with the understanding that he was on a two-year apprenticeship or probation period with the understanding that he will go back to take his social work training. This is the understanding that people have who come on in this particular category. He was one of them and he worked with our department - and I'd like members of the House just to get the dates - from September, 1964 to August, 1966. He was with us exactly two years. I'm not saying he didn't have other experience in the welfare field; I don't know. But it would surprise me if he did. He possibly did; I don't know. But I go on just to point the kind of inaccuracy that was in the remarks mentioned by the Member for Gladstone.

He goes on in the next paragraph to read a quotation from my opening remarks on Page 974, and he makes a very small mistake in his quotation, again inaccurate. I don't know whether it was deliberately inaccurate or not but he changed the word 'unemployable' to 'unemployed' and if my friend doesn't understand the difference, the significance, the distinction between these two words, then I think he should find out, because it makes a very substantial difference in our welfare budget, the estimates that are before the House. I just draw that to the attention of the House. --(Interjection)-- You're quoted on Page 1043 as saying, "unemployed." Do you want me to read it all? I quote the Member for Gladstone: "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 the Mothers' Allowance category, the blind, the physically and mentally disabled, the unemployed, child welfare." Do you agree then that you were inaccurate in your statement - or that Hansard's inaccurate? I don't want.... Yes, quite true. It's easy to make that mistake.

I go on now to one of the major points, I suppose, that was made by the Member for Gladstone speaking as the spokesman for his Party on welfare matters - "One of the reasons that there is discontent and dissatisfaction in the Department of Welfare..." - being an expert, I suppose he knows of the discontent and dissatisfaction - "One of the major reasons is due to the fact that there does not seem to be any standard basic program of needs test for all categories. No one standard needs test." Well I would like to just say that we do have a standard needs test for our Social Allowances Act. However, he goes on to bring into it the other categorical programs that are not needs-tested. This is the program for which the Federal Government is responsible. We pass reciprocal legislation; we administer on behalf of the Federal Government who establish the rules. And the means test applies to Old Age Assistance, Blind Person's Allowances and the Disability Allowance. It is true that the municipalities use their own judgment in establishing their criteria for issuing welfare, and it was with respect to this that I made a statement a year ago saying that I hoped that within a year we would be moving toward some kind of uniformity or standardization with respect to welfare standards by municipalities. In fact under the Canada Assistance Plan they require municipalities to publish, or to pass by by-law the rates of assistance that apply to that municipality, and I was hopeful that this would be the procedure by which we might move toward this kind of uniformity.

My friends are all aware of the Canada Assistance Plan that was heralded last July as being the cure-all for many of the welfare problems, and I think it will be. I think it's a good move; it's a progressive move. After all, they followed the lead of this House here who passed

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... the Social Allowances Act and the principles are almost identical in the two. Now this was passed last July. I don't know the date in July but it was early July that the Canada Assistance Plan was passed, and the regulations arrived here on February 8th, the same date as my honourable friend wrote me his important letter. It arrived on February 8th and I talked about some kind of chaos within the department, some kind of confusion that resulted from this long delay in knowing just what the Federal Government were going to require by way of regulations under this Canada Assistance Plan. We haven't been able to communicate with the municipalities of Manitoba until we know exactly where the federal government is going with respect to the Canada Assistance Plan. And incidentally, all of our welfare expenditures for the fiscal year 1966-67 - that's commencing last April - are to be shared under the new Canada Assistance Plan. So if you think we aren't in some kind of trouble trying to adjust our programs and everything else... our recovery based on that program, this is a real major undertaking and one of the problems that I was referring to in the opening statement. We wanted to know, for instance, how the new guaranteed income proposals for the Old Age Security cases was going to be handled under the new sharing program for the Canada Assistance Plan. I think the Leader of the NDP hit the nail right on the head, right on the head, when he said, "They've introduced another means test." And this is an altogether different criteria again; so if people are confused about the standards of applying tests, then we can look to my honourable friend's - his friends in Ottawa, because they're the ones who are adding to this confusion. --(Interjection)-- They've got another means test so if my honourable friend wants means tests, that's what he's got. This is what everybody's been arguing against in recent years.

But I would like to know where my friends stand on this guaranteed income provision. I really would like to know. I'd really like to know, because I understand there's no uniformity in the Party that sits across from me, and I'm ruling out the NDP. Now I'm looking at the Official Opposition because they had a convention last August and that was a very interesting convention. The report, August 13th in the Tribune: "Several Manitoba delegates spoke against the proposal which according to one Saskatchewan speaker smelled of rank Socialism." This is what our friends in Manitoba reported in the Tribune as having said about the new guaranteed income proposal. --(Interjection, Mr. Shoemaker). Well, you have quite a few that don't agree. You've got Mr. Frank Muldoon; he described it as bland pap. He said it would be laughed at when it reached the federal cabinet; it would be laughed at and tabled. This is what he said.

"Among the Manitobans joining Mr. Muldoon in opposition is Margaret Konantz," (We all know who she is), "Howard Loewen..." - I think he was a candidate some place or other during the last election - "Rudy Usick and others..."

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, give your views on the...

MR. CARROLL: Well if you'd like my views on it, I think that the Old Age Security people should have had an increase in aid, and it shouldn't have been means tested. That's what I think.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well that's not what your Premier said.

MR. CARROLL: We'll let the Premier speak for himself when he gets here but if this is as accurate as the other statements that my honourable friend made in his speech in this House just a few days ago, I don't put much faith in it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I'll look up and see what your Premier said on that one.

MR. CARROLL: Unfortunately I have to leave now and deal with some of the other comments that were made. The Leader of the NDP commented on the hostel and personal care home program of which he has some official interest, and I think that we would agree with him with respect to the need for new personal care homes in the metropolitan area. We've undertaken to proceed at full steam ahead with respect to those homes that are presently under consideration and I believe that we're moving as quickly as we can to try to facilitate the development of more personal care homes in the metropolitan area. Talks are presently under way between the solicitor of the Concordia Hospital, the Departments of Health, Welfare and the Hospital Commission with a view to developing a program that will be found acceptable, we hope, when they finally come forward with this submission.

The Leader of the NDP was asking about the sales tax - was it taken into account in establishing our scale of grants? Well, I'd like to say that our food budget was based on the Canada Food Laws and our total budgets were then compared with the other provinces who have sales taxes within them and we believe that you will find that our scale of allowances

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).... compares very favourably with all of the others and does include those increases that we foresee in the immediate future. --(Interjection)-- No, no. No sales tax on food. Oh yes, there's sales tax on clothing, sales tax on some of the personal needs, possibly, of the individuals involved.

The Member for Burrows was talking about our program being too late and no co-ordination with respect to the policies that were being implemented. Well I suppose it's too late to deal with a person's problems when he arrives at retirement age, where no longer he's able to work and he hasn't been able to put aside sufficient in terms of savings to carry him through his years of retirement. I think it's too late at that stage and this is the stage at which they arrive at the welfare office asking for some kind of assistance. It's too late when the deserted mother arrives with five children and her husband has gone for six months and she doesn't know where he is. This is too late. It's too late when a judge declares a child neglected and we're left with the responsibility of having to provide care for that child.

Now we do try to provide protection services, to provide counselling, in such a way that we can try to keep families together that are in difficulties and on the verge of breakup. We try to repair the damage as best we can, and for those that we can't we try to provide the good adoption programs and foster care programs and things of this kind. I don't know how far government responsibility goes into this particular field. I think individuals have responsibilities; families have responsibilities; church groups and other community organizations have a responsibility to provide a healthy environment so that families can live and stay together and get the kind of strength they can from their friends and neighbours that will probably help them to be able to survive the stresses of modern society. We try to help as best we can to create this wholesome atmosphere.

I think one needs only look at where we are spending our money, you know, to determine that we could probably spend a great deal more wisely if we were interested in the future of our children. I know I've been associated with a community club for a number of years and we have great difficulty in an area that I think could be described as having a fair average income, and the very great difficulty we have in selling \$3.00 memberships to support a community club that provides the only recreation in our immediate area for the children of the community, the family skating and other kinds of family recreation. I think one needs to look very very closely at the kind of priorities in our own spending, to find out whether we're spending as wisely as we should. We can look at some of the other establishments for adult recreation in the metropolitan area. We find they're much more elaborate, and I think one might well question whether we have established the proper sorts of priorities if we're interested in protecting the welfare of children and the welfare of families.

Now with respect to co-ordination of service, the social service audit was announced some time ago. The province is helping to finance that in co-operation with the Winnipeg Foundation and the United Way, and we have the whole-hearted co-operation of all of the health, welfare and recreational agencies in the metropolitan area. Now we talk about lack of co-ordination, lack of co-operation. I think this is the highest example of the fullest co-operation of all departments and of all agencies involved in this work. I understand that there's some 4,000 private citizens who will be giving of their time to help to get the facts and to sort out the facts on which we can base the future programs in social welfare in its broadest terms -- in the social welfare field in the metropolitan area. I think this is an example of good co-ordination rather than an example of bad co-ordination as was suggested. I think that we can talk about good co-ordination in terms of the new care services agency that was established to work with, to co-ordinate the services of the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare in dealing with people who require care, and we're working with the hospitals, with the Hospital Commission, with all of the agencies that cater to the needs of elderly people. We're working with the personal care homes, with a foster care program for people who require care. We're working with the Victorian Order of Nurses and many other agencies. And this was a first in Canada, as far as we know, where two agencies of government got together to work with the community in providing care for people who required help in their daily living because of a physical frailty, and many cases involving financial difficulties as well, so that we brought these services together so that people could have this kind of co-ordination that the member for Burrows says the departments lack.

He talked about the prevention of delinquency - I think he was referring mainly to northern Manitoba. I think we're the first to recognize that there has been a problem in remote and isolated areas with young people who lack opportunities for employment, who have lacked

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).... opportunities for a better education, which is one of the keys to being able to get along in our society today and one of the problems which is causing delinquency and things of this kind.

We've had the best of co-operation from the Department of Education in establishing a frontier school division to get to the people in these isolated and remote areas who haven't had access to the kind of educational facilities that would give them a reasonable chance for an education in our society. And we have established the fine new school at Cranberry Portage, and I hope that the members who will be going on the trip north will take advantage of that opportunity to see the children from these remote areas coming together in what we think is a pretty good environment to do something more than just given the academics. We hope to be able to introduce some social and cultural training and other things as well to give them a good background to help them to fit into society. We'll be opening the Northern Manitoba Technical School at The Pas, another educational program that we think will do a great deal to combat the kind of delinquency that resulted in the outbreak that was referred to.

We talk about co-ordination, or lack of co-ordination, and I'd just like to refer again to history, in the Dominion of Canada's first, the first metropolitan area in the Dominion of Canada to have a program to deal with the problems of slum areas, in our multi-service project. This was conducted with the help of the Winnipeg Foundation again, the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg Welfare Department, also the co-operation of the Department of Health, the Probation Service of the Attorney-General. We engaged the services of Neighbourhood Services Centre to add a feature which is unique, too, on the North American continent to try to introduce the principle of self-help programs of community development in an underdeveloped area, I think here again an example of pioneering, possibly, an example of co-ordination, an example of co-operation with respect to the various agencies involved. In these areas we find that there is ten times as much child neglect among the population in the underdeveloped areas -- urban area, as there are in the rest of the metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg. We have an indigency rate of 4.5% higher than the rest of the metropolitan area. Juvenile delinquency was almost three times higher, and temporary illness and absence from school represented a third of the absences from the whole of the City of Winnipeg, and of course the income is substantially lower than the average income throughout the rest of Metropolitan Winnipeg and an area of course where transients tend to congregate. It was for this reason that we have decided to proceed again with a co-ordinated approach to the problems of people in the urban renewal area. This is why we've been working on a new program that we think will be exciting and imaginative, that will help the local people to take maximum advantage of social and economic opportunities with an emphasis on prevention, re-direction of the family, trying to engage people who are on public assistance to give them a new start in life. It's sort of a community development program in the metropolitan area to which we will be assigning community development staff. We will be combining the services of the various departments of government; we'll be working in co-operation with the other agencies that are involved in this area as well - another example, we think, of good co-ordination and good co-operation.

The member for Burrows talked about rural slums and rural poverty, the lack of co-ordination in the Interlake area. I would like to say that from my brief experience with the ARDA project that there has been a high degree of co-ordination, at least in the planning stage, and with respect to our own department we are establishing community development services in that area to help ARDA, as best we can to assist that project get off the ground and to be able to do the kinds of things that we want it to do for the people in the Interlake area.

I believe the member for Burrows referred specifically to farming for Indian people, and I'm just wondering whether he had an opportunity to look at the reports that appeared in the Winnipeg papers, I believe, and in the Brandon Sun, about September 3rd, in which they talk about - the Winnipeg Free Press was September 12th, the Brandon Sun was September 3rd - where they talk about the results of the community development projects on the Oak River Reserve, people who had been sitting on agricultural land since the times of the treaties presumably, who have shown really very little inclination to farm, to use the land productively, who have during the last two years become successful, and in fact the best contract that was let by Catelli Foods was filled by the group on the Oak River Reserve with rather outstanding success; and they list in these reports many of the other programs that have developed in the community within the last year or two, and which I think are doing a great deal to help combat rural slums in communities where there is a great deal of underdevelopment with our Indian and Metis people.

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

The member referred to our annual report, and I am very glad that he did. I am glad that he took time to read it. I am sorry that he didn't get all of the fine implications of everything that was in here, but at least he took the trouble to read it and I am certainly glad that he did because I think community development is a program that has a great deal to offer in terms of helping to combat rural slums - and city slums, for that matter.

Community development I think one would describe very briefly, the aim of community development: to assist people of Indian ancestry to achieve full participating citizenship. I think you can use the word Indian, Metis or others, "to achieve full participating citizenship." I just mention this. I think the Member for Burrows feels that community development should be going in there to initiate projects and I think the philosophy of community development might best be expressed as being a sort of a catalyst. It's an agency that goes in to help people to talk about, to think about and to make plans to do something about their problems and ultimately to attain success in meeting their community needs or their individual needs. A recent description of it was to help a non-community to become a community, and in most of these isolated rural slums we don't have any community spirit, any community feeling. It's everybody living unsatisfactorily with problems but without being able to do anything about them themselves because they feel incapable; they need help. And also to help those who move out of this kind of environment to become part of a larger community wherever they happen to go.

I think we would all agree that a few years ago the Indians were self reliant, showed all of the initiative and the leadership qualities that they had. They demonstrated them; in fact the early white settlers leaned on the Indians when they came to this country. The Indians shared with them their way of life. They taught the white man how to travel in this country. They shared their food with them in times of trouble. They shared many things of this kind, but we know that with the reserves and the advancing agricultural development, the rolling back of the frontiers, that these people were pushed back and the game was destroyed partly. Certainly the environment on which they depended for their grazing and so on was pushed back to the extent that they were becoming depleted; the trapping grounds were similarly destroyed. At the same time we have this increasing population that is providing real pressures. I think the real problem we face is the clash of cultures coming together as they must, and this provides a very real barrier for our Indian people.

The Member for Burrows talked about a one-way ticket to Winnipeg. Too often a one-way ticket to Winnipeg was a one-way ticket to disillusionment, to disaster, and to despair for many of the people that went out, and we are learning from these failures who are also learning from the successes, and we are helping to prepare the way for them, to point out some of the pitfalls, to share our skills and know-how as the Indian shared with us a few years ago, so that the Indian of the future, if it's his desire, may move more freely and easily into our society that he may regain his confidence; and there is ample evidence before us that this process is now well begun.

I would like to speak very briefly, if I could, about the Vocational Opportunities Services program which is a branch of Community Development. Vocational Opportunities Services is one of six designated rehabilitation agencies in Manitoba. The objective of the program is to assist those persons who, although physically and mentally fit, are nevertheless handicapped as a result of a complexity of environmental, cultural and economic factors. This need is not confined to persons of Indian ancestry although it is generally more apparent in this group. The function of the program is to assist these occupationally and socially handicapped persons in identifying their needs, in assessing their interests and aptitudes and gaining knowledge in the wideness of opportunities for training and employment, and of the resources and services necessary to their achieving the desired goal of our social and economic independence. In assisting people to achieve this goal, more is required than simply providing the means of acquiring academic and vocational skill and the resources of relocation. I think this is an important statement. Unless adequate follow-up support is provided, and that means assistance in adjustment to change of circumstances, environment and of culture, then what occurs is simply the transferring of the problems of one area to another where they are complicated by dislocation and disillusionment. Follow-up may simply be described as assistance in coping with the day to day problems of living or working in a new environment and under new circumstances.

The Vocational Opportunities Program as it is now functioning came into being about

MR. CARROLL cont'd)..... September '65. However, only three of the present staff were employed prior to September '66. The bulk of our build-up of staff has been in the last very few months. Offices have been established in some of our outlying areas.

Now the Member for Burrows was asking about employment of Indian people, and what we have been doing to help Indian people get into employment. I would like to say that the number of persons who have registered with our program since April 1, 1966 to January 31, 1967 is 1,723, making a total of 2,687 who received service during that period because we had some persons registered with the Department prior to April 1st of last year. Now what has happened to these people that are receiving services from this branch?

MR. CHAIRMAN: committee please simmer down. You can hardly hear the Minister of Welfare speaking. Proceed, Sir.

MR. CARROLL: In the training: basic training for skill development 585; into the regular school system 7; into vocational training, provincial schools 101, private trade schools 16, on the job training 96. Into employment - and I want to just emphasize the word "employment" - into employment 1,030; withdrawal from services and referrals to other agencies 286; under assessment or awaiting services 593. I would like to mention very briefly, if I can, some of the places where these people are working. International Nickel Company at Thompson, there are 48 employed in that community; the Manitoba Sugar Company 32; the Eviscerating Plant at Niverville 22; and with respect to the others that I am going to be reading out, the placements are two or three or possibly a few more, but certainly not any large numbers.

I am going to read these because I think it will be of interest to the members of the Committee to know where these people are being placed, where our assistance is going, where the money that is being provided in these estimates will be spent in helping our Indian-Metis people to take employment in our society. In the mining field - International Nickel Company at Thompson, Sherritt Gordon at Lynn Lake, Acme Welding -- I won't read the kinds of employment that they're engaged in, I'll just read the companies. I think you can more or less infer the kinds of occupations although I can give that to the committee as well if they would like it: Acme Welding, Canadian Rogers Western Limited, Bullocks Limited, Motor Coach Industries, Kipp Kelly Limited, Pioneer Electric, D. Thompson Electric, A. E. I. Telecommunications, Quality Construction Limited, Borger Bros. Ltd., Pool Construction, Northern Concrete Finishers, Maitre Construction, Pool Construction, Plexcraft Limited, Federated Coops, Sheffield Plating, Imperial Roadways, Canadian National Railway, Canadian Rogers Western Ltd., Markwell Industries, Coldstream Refrigeration Manufacturing Ltd., British American Construction, Grand Motors, Sheffield Plating - that got in there twice; oh, it's a different category of work, I'm sorry. They've broken them down by category of work. One was engaged in the shipping, receiving and general warehouse work and the other happened to be engaged in the plating business. They are sort of broken down by category of employment as well as by employer, and I don't mean to try to inflate the figures but I do think they are impressive because our placement program hasn't been working that long and I think they've had tremendous results during that period of time.

Kataroff Plating Limited, Ideal Brass and Plating Company, Indian Affairs, Provincial Civil Service, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Easterville Fishermen's Co-op, Simpson-Sears, B. A. Construction again, Red River Road Builders, Penner Construction, Midwest Diamond Drilling, Manitoba Hydro, Patriotic Salvage Corporation, City of Winnipeg. If you don't want to hear them I won't read them, but I think we've got an impressive list; I think this group have done a wonderful job, and for those who say nothing is being done I think one has to put the facts on the table. Winnipeg General Hospital, Manitoba Sanatorium Board, Deer Lodge Hospital, Bristol Aerospace Limited, Community Development Services, Provincial Department of Education, Sanatorium Board of Manitoba, Manitoba Paper Company, Dart Lumber Company, Perth's, P. M. Scientific Limited, Harborwood Industries, Dyck's Industries Limited, etc. etc.

Now this is the list that I have here. That doesn't mean that this is exclusive. I think there may be others in which we have had something to do but this is the list that was drawn up for me fairly quickly a day or two ago, and it does not take into account all of the jobs that have been attained or procured by people who have been operating on their own initiative. I'd like to say that this is a very substantial number. I know in our part of the country that before the Second World War there were practically no Indians involved in the maintenance of the Canadian National Railways and I suspect now that the entire maintenance program north

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . . . of The Pas is almost 100 percent Indian-Metis labour. We've had a tremendous movement of people into employment, into steady employment - good workers who are certainly doing a good job in helping to build the northern parts of our province and we certainly want to lend every encouragement we can to help them to move into the metropolitan - urban environment where jobs are more plentiful and where many of them will have to come if they are to obtain a fair share of the rewards of our society.

I would like to just comment for a moment on the final sum-up, wrap-up paragraph of the Member for Burrows in which he said that not all would be sharing in Canada's birthday. Well I would hope that we, in this House, don't really feel this way because I think birthday parties, while they do depend to some extent on economic security - one's outlook depends on economic security and other things - I think that Canada's national birthday will be celebrated in all parts of our province by all of our people, those who are in high incomes and those who are in low incomes and those who may have to be supported by departments such as ours. I hope we'll all be able to share in this Centennial Birthday Party and certainly we're going to make every effort as best we can to help those that we serve to get the fullest measure of enjoyment from our Centennial celebrations.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, now that the experts are all finished I hope I, as a layman, can deal with a couple of points which I have been considering for some time. The first point which I wish to deal with is adoption by a married man of his wife's children by a previous marriage or of her illegitimate children. And the second problem with which I wish to deal is the plight of the deserted wife and of a wife living separate and apart from her husband under an order granted pursuant to the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act or under a judicial separation granted under the Matrimonial Clauses Act.

Now, dealing with adoption first. Members of this Committee are aware of the fact that the only restrictions placed upon a marriage in Manitoba are the following: First, age; second, neither of the contracting parties must come within the prohibitive degrees of consanguinity; and both parties must pass a Wasserman test. In other words, they do not have to be pure but they must be sanitary. Now, no investigation or prerequisite respecting the suitability or the moral character of these parties, is made and this too is notwithstanding the fact that a man may marry a widow with children or a divorcee with children, or marry a woman who has had illegitimate children, and there is no investigation made as to the background or character of that man to ascertain his suitability of living in the same house as these children with their mother.

MR. CARROLL: Doesn't the mother have something to do with it?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Oh, I'll come to that in a minute. Now, in other words, our law does not concern itself at all on whether or no that man is a proper individual to have the custody and control of these children along with the mother, but at the same time the law imposes an obligation on that man to support and maintain these children as long as they are under the age of sixteen years of age. But here's where the rub comes. If that man decides that he wants to adopt these children, what has he got to do? He makes an application to the Director of Welfare for an Order of Adoption. He has to pay the Director of Welfare \$25.00 in respect of each one of these children. Now I have had several of such applications. Last year I asked the Honourable Minister what this fee of \$25.00 was charged for. I never got an answer. Now the point is this: I want to know whether there's any investigation made into the suitability of that husband as an adopting parent, and if no investigation is made into the suitability of that husband as an adopting parent why is he charged a fee of \$25.00 for each child that he adopted?

Now this situation could become absolutely ludicrous. Supposing there was an investigation made by the Department of Welfare into the suitability of that man as an adopting parent, and supposing the social worker who made that investigation could not come up with a recommendation that that adoption would go through, what position would your department be in? Here you would have a case of a man married to a woman who is under a legal obligation to support and maintain her children until the youngest is sixteen years of age, and yet he is incapable under our law of adopting these children. Now my point is this: that you either make up your mind as to whether you're going to make an investigation into the suitability of people to enter into matrimony, and if you're not going to make such an investigation you drop your charge of \$25.00 in respect to the adoption of these children, because the two of them don't jibe and they're totally inconsistent.

I had a case the other day of a young chap, he married a girl and she had three children.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)..... He figured that there would be nothing to it; all he would have to do would be to file a formal application. I told him it would cost him \$75.00; he'd have to pay that to the Department of Welfare. Now he can't understand that and I don't blame him for not understanding it. The thing is absolutely absurd. You have two inconsistent positions that that individual is in. He is legally liable to support these children; he is the husband of the children's mother; and yet he has to pay tribute to the Department of Welfare of \$25.00 a child before he can adopt them. To me that is absolutely absurd. But here is a case of a man who by adopting these children is placing these children in the same position as they would be if they were his natural children. They inherit his estate, are entitled to inherit his estate. Now I suggest to the Minister that he should look into this matter, cancel the fee of \$25.00 that's been paid or has to be paid, and return to all people in Manitoba who have paid that fee, the fee that they have paid.

The other matter which I'd like to deal with -- but before I leave this, that situation you know, Mr. Chairman, places the average man on the street in the position of really believing that the law is an ass. And the law is an ass in that respect, and we are the people here who can change that law, and if we don't change it what are we going to be called?

A MEMBER: It may not be parliamentary, Tom.

MR. HILLHOUSE: No, but it's true. It's true.

Now the second matter with which I'd like to deal is this. I would like to deal with the plight of the deserted wife or of the wife who is living separate and apart from her husband under an Order granted by a police magistrate or a County Court judge under the provisions of the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act, or under a judicial separation granted by a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. Now in the case of the deserted wife the Crown will use all of its resources and all of its assets to bring that husband back and obtain from the Court whatever order the Court deems to be necessary and essential in that case. But take the case of the wife who has a separation from her husband or the wife who has obtained an Order under the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act or a judicial separation, the Crown takes no part in assisting that woman to enforce that Order, and I say that that is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's now 12:30. I wonder if the honourable member would like to continue at

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 12:30. I leave the Chair until 2:30 this afternoon.