

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, February 20, 1967

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, as you called it 5:30 I was just about to sit down, but I would like to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare at least one other question before he replies. On February 14th I wrote at least two letters to constituents of mine and sent a copy to the Minister so that he will be quite aware of the content of the letters in question, but the closing paragraph of both letters said, and I quote, "I understand that recent regulations respecting The Social Allowances Act are more liberal for persons falling into the unemployable category. If this is so, I suggest that you, Mr. So and so, will now qualify for social allowance."

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his opening statement suggested that The Social Allowances Act would be broadened to include certain categories that heretofore had not been covered under the Act and I hope that he will elaborate on the extent to which the Act has been liberalized, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps that now the Minister would be kind enough to comment on the comments that I have made and supply the House with the schedule - the new schedule of basic needs that he promised the House that we would receive during his estimates, because it's very difficult for members of the House to intelligently discuss the basic needs unless we have the schedule before us, and surely at this time, Mr. Chairman, he will supply each and every member of the House with the new schedule of basic needs. He said on numerous occasions that there would be an upgrading; that they would be allowed \$5.00 more for food and a set amount more for rent in consideration of the impact that the five percent sales tax would have on their cost of living, and I think it is only fair and right that we should demand the new schedule.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to raise a point on housing situations for the physically handicapped people in Winnipeg. I think there's a great need exists in Winnipeg for hostel type accommodation for people that are handicapped through illness or accident and are unable to live independently in ordinary houses. I feel that these people can lead a productive self-sufficient life if accommodated in a building adapted to meet their personal need.

I know that there is a great demand for that type of facility in Winnipeg today. I feel that physically handicapped persons -- there seems to be no half-way point in housing between expensive protective care and self-units that these people can live in by themselves. I feel a type of a hostel that is required is a half-way house for physically handicapped people, a step between hospital care and rehab training, and a full return to community living. I think that we should look at low rental type housing for single persons; low rental type housing for married couples; and as well, a hostel type accommodation for maintenance of handicapped persons who are unable to manage their own household. I would say that there is definite need for these three categories: single people - which is self-contained units, cheap low rental units; the married people and the hostel type accommodation.

There is an increasing acceptance in our society that it is wrong to institutionalize these people as a matter of convenience, so that's why I say it would be worthwhile for the Minister to look -- that we should be thinking about and providing some of these people with low rental type of accommodation, because at the present time many of these people are housed with the old age people or in the homes that have been set up for people that are of the ages of 65 to 75, while many of these handicapped people are in the young age area between 20 and 25 and 30, and I think it's wrong to provide accommodation for the physically handicapped in an age group that are in such a different age from the old age people.

So I again would like to stress that the physically handicapped individual forced into unsuitable housing or nursing homes and infirmary care is deprived of any opportunity to utilize the skills that he has learned in the rehab center, and I would wonder if the Minister could tell us if the present Act allows the same assistance to the physically handicapped as it does to the old age people. I would like to know what facilities have we - low rental facilities for these people in the Greater Winnipeg area, if any. As far as I know from the information that I have, there is a real need for these people, for the physically handicapped, because you cannot put them in the same places as the old age. I'd like the Minister to tell the House what is the present situation.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister to clarify a couple of points in his estimates. The one in particular that I am interested in is the

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . . question of the social welfare participation on the part of the province in the municipal welfare payments made through the municipal offices. At the present time I believe the share is on a 60 - 40, the 40 percent being paid by the province, 60 percent by the municipality.

Now the problem really is, apart from the share not being enough, the real problem I feel is the complete lack of uniformity within Manitoba or even within Greater Winnipeg itself. You have the province having one scale, the City of Winnipeg another scale, each municipality having its own scale, and too often these scales of welfare are determined by the local council based on either their own peculiar ideas of what welfare payments should be made; other times simply because some municipalities haven't the financial resources to make adequate payments - and I'm thinking that within Winnipeg you'll have or did have a municipality like Brooklands who was a very low assessment and a very low per capita income, an area where a recession would probably hit first and hardest - and yet that area, with probably the highest rate of unemployment, would be faced with immediate welfare payments and yet not have the assessment to back it up and could not support it. On the other end of the spectrum you would have Tuxedo with probably no welfare payments to make at all and not participating in that sense in any of the Greater Winnipeg welfare plans.

So I think it's high time that the Provincial Government recognizes that welfare should not be based on the opinion or on the financial support within a given municipality, but it would have to be looked at as a total problem. The fact that an individual may live in a given area at a particular time of month or year when he may be out of work really should not be a responsibility of his immediate neighbours but the responsibility of the community as a whole and of the province as a whole. So I think that - although I gather the Minister had hopes, I think that in one of his remarks he mentioned that last year he had hopes that with the Canada Assistance Plan coming into being that he might be able to do something about this problem - I think that whether the Federal Government is involved in this or not we in Manitoba have to recognize that this is a problem that involves all of us and that we cannot and should not leave it to individual municipalities to decide how much they should pay the welfare recipients; on what basis they should do it; and, too often, how little they can get away with.

The other point I'd like to bring up is the question of the proclamation of the balance of those sections of The Social Allowances Act which were first passed in 1959. I believe they were proclaimed in October of this year, and I remember when the Minister was speaking and complaining that they had waited for six months for the regulations to come from Ottawa to Winnipeg with regard to the new Canada Assistance plan. The Manitoba Gazette published in October, I think it was 1966, that the various sections of The Social Allowances Act had been proclaimed but it wasn't until February of this year that the municipal offices were notified by letter that this was the case. As a result, many of the social workers or Social Welfare Departments simply were not in a position to act on the new information immediately. It's true they could have followed the Manitoba Gazette, I suppose, and had they been in tune with the thing they could have spotted it, but these people are not necessarily trained to follow the Manitoba Gazette too closely. Also, in reading the Manitoba Gazette it's sometimes difficult to spot the nub of the proclamation really because it refers to a certain subsection of a certain date and an Act which is now being proclaimed, and unless you track it down you can't always follow it. So I think there is a need to keep the various provincial departments -- or rather municipal departments well informed and quickly informed as these changes take place.

Now one of these changes was the provincial support for women who were deserted over one year - previously it was four years, now it's one year. At the present time the department hasn't yet caught up with all the referrals of the four-year situation and I'm concerned that -- and the word from the department is that they have such a backlog of the old referrals to deal with that they can't even entertain the new referrals that will be coming in to them. Whether this is due to a lack of shortage of staff or what it is I'm not sure, but I think there should be clarification. If the government has proclaimed this section of the Act, then I assume they should be prepared to act on it.

The other part of this that I would like clarification on is this: when a case is referred - and it goes I gather to some investigative procedure, a panel hearing and then the government decides if it will accept this case - it is not retroactive to the time that the city or the agency has made the referral and I think it's only fair that it should be retroactive. If the department hasn't the staff to act immediately on these things and if the cities or the municipalities have to wait six months to a year to get these cases accepted, I think it's only right that the

(MR. MILLER cont'd) retroactive feature should be accepted and that these cases will be paid for by the province from the date that the application was made, and I think in support of that I'd like to suggest to the Minister that when he mentioned that the Canada Assistance Plan, although he didn't get the regulations until I think it was February he mentioned, February 8th, nonetheless the Federal Government would be picking up their portion of the assistance for the entire fiscal year of 1966. I suggest if the Federal Government is going to recognize the retro-active feature, the Province of Manitoba must do the same.

These are the two items I'd like answered at this time.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, in the Department of Welfare's report, the first paragraph, "The Branch of Elderly and Infirm Persons, working as an integral part of the Department of Welfare, are continuing its active role in assisting municipal non-profit and charitable sponsors to create special kinds of accommodation required to meet the needs of the aged and frail persons." Mr. Chairman, this is a department of the Department of Welfare that is becoming more necessary throughout the province than it has been in former years, but I'm wondering if the department is taking a good firm look at the costs that they are imposing on these people in welfare and the people that are paying their own by not having a more constructive idea of the type of building and the comforts that are provided. I'm thinking of the fact that from personal experience I know that several of these homes have been built and conformed to the standards of the department, have received their grants, and they do this at a cost plus price of approximately \$5,000 per unit; and then you look across the field and you'll see others that are upwards of \$7,000 or more; and if the Minister will reveal to the House the different rates of remuneration that are being paid to these various homes throughout the country, I think it will relate the point I'm trying to make. If a home can provide the comforts necessary for the aged and infirm for a fee of \$3.00 or \$3.25 per day and the costs are upwards of \$4.50 to \$5.00 or thereabouts in other homes for similar type of accommodation, then I say that we're doing an injustice to the elderly people because the people that are paying their own way have to pay this increased cost and we are doing an injustice to the Province of Manitoba by having to pay out this kind of differential. And so it's a concern of mine that if the Minister would give us these rates, I think the House could easily see where the spread is and I think that somewhere along the line there should be a little closer look in regard to the type of construction.

I'll give you one example that we found in building a home that I was interested in. The department went along with the various plans and agreed and said fine, if you want to do it, why go ahead. Just as a matter of interest, the plumbing and heating of this particular home was something in the neighbourhood of \$85,000, and this sounded to me to be quite excessive, but when I brought it back to another sub-contractor who would put in the conventional automatic type of heating it was done for \$30,000. So you see these are the kind of items that I am referring to that I think the department would be doing a great favour to the elderly and to the province if they had some type of control on these buildings. I know that from the point of view of a municipal operation that this can be done cheaper. When you go into the other organizations under Central Mortgage and Housing it's going to cost more. And I'm wondering, in the interest of the people, if the department would take a good look at this, because I think in the long run this would be more beneficial to the elderly people and to the Province of Manitoba as a whole.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would answer two questions:

(1) In respect of Mother's Allowance, how much land is a widow allowed to own; and (2) How much money is she allowed to have in the bank before she becomes eligible for Mother's Allowance, assuming that she has all the other qualifications necessary to qualify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, if we've exhausted most of the questions at this stage, I could maybe start and comment on some of the questions that have been raised.

With respect to the last question first, a widow with a family who qualified for Mother's Allowance is generally speaking allowed to stay in her own home even though she may be paying mortgage payments on it, providing it is not excessive for the needs of her family. If she were living in a \$50,000 home on Wellington Crescent, I rather suspect that we would insist that she move out into another area of the city where she could invest her capital in a home of much lesser value, and if she still needed assistance at that stage, presumably we would be willing to continue her on in that home and would continue to even make mortgage payments on

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . . . the house providing the mortgage payment itself was not beyond our rent ceiling. If it's beyond the rent ceiling then that portion of it which is beyond the rent ceiling would be filed as a lien against the home, because this portion of it would obviously be going to build an equity in the home and we feel that when she disposes of that house ultimately we should have a return of that portion which has gone into building capital on her behalf. If she happens to be a farmer's wife, is living on the farm, presumably I think it's the home quarter that she's allowed to retain. If she has other properties associated with the farm, then we expect her to sell those and use the money to support herself and her family.

With respect to the question of the Member for Turtle Mountain, I think one of the biggest fights we have in this program under the Elderly Persons Housing program is to try to get the standards down so that the rent value will be within reach of most of the people who will reside in that home, and I think we've had more fights with sponsoring organizations and with architects and with everybody associated with these projects to try and keep these rental values low than for any other reason. We have used consulting architects; we've tried to cut out all the frills; essentially and ultimately the plan is the plan selected by the local people. We often ask them to make additional capital contributions if we think the project is too rich, if the rents are too high, in order that they should be brought down within what we consider to be a reasonable rent structure. Our scale of grants is set out of course in our various legislation. I think it's 1,750 for a hostel or a single housing unit going up to \$2,000 per bed for a personal care home. We have ceilings on personal care homes of 8,600 at the present time. Here again we've had many projects that have been unable to start because people say they can't build them within that range. Fortunately, most of them finally decide they can come in within that figure and many of them have proceeded on that basis.

The Member for Seven Oaks was commenting on the cost-sharing formula with municipalities. We refer to the formula as a 40-80 formula. I know it doesn't add up, but we pay 40 percent of all welfare costs or eighty percent over one mill, whichever is more favourable to the municipality involved. It is true that there are differing fields of grants as between different municipalities. We had hoped and still hope that the scale of grants for municipalities will eventually bring them closer together so that we will be working toward a common schedule of grants for various municipalities.

The proclamation of The Social Allowances Act. We have always indicated that under The Social Allowances Act that we assess need on an individual basis and that we can't take large numbers of cases from municipalities at one time; we have to work them out on individual basis. I have been advised that we have no desertion cases over four years that haven't been assumed up to the time when we started taking one year desertions. We have indicated that we hope to have all the one year desertions by April 1, 1967. We have never undertaken to pay retroactively. I suppose if we had access to the kind of money they've got in Ottawa maybe we could afford to do this, however, we have been assuming very large costs from municipalities in recent years and we think that this in itself has been a very substantial benefit to the municipalities in assuming this caseload from them, so we don't propose to follow the precedent which was established when the Canada Assistance Plan was formed. However, we do hope to work as best we can, as quickly as we can to try to assume the caseload in the various municipalities in the province.

Housing for the physically handicapped. The only housing I'm aware of that does apply for the physically disabled is under our Elderly and Inform Persons Housing where they may be housed in personal care homes. There haven't been too many of these built. Some of the ones that are being built now are going or are considering going for what they call family units where you can segregate younger people in certain wings of the institution so that people with similar interests, similar outlooks on life, may be together and may be much happier than in an environment - that places them in with a lot of elderly people whose outlook is obviously quite different.

We have no proposal at the present time to proceed further in housing construction for the physically handicapped who may be able to be outside of institutions of this kind. We are trying to help those people as best we can to lead as closely as possible a normal life in with other people keeping them mixed in with the regular population and not segregating them in individual housing units and this may be a very desirable thing. However, it is very low on priority because of the other pressing needs that faces our department and other departments as well.

Mr. Chairman, now I'd like to refer back once again to our Annual Report because I

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . think in the report on our Division of Welfare Services, Mr. McArton or someone in his department has quoted something here that I think has been amply demonstrated by the debate that's been going on in the House. I refer to the second paragraph on Page 12 in which it reads as follows: "Welfare programs are criticized for being too lenient and too niggardly; for refusing aid to the worthy and granting it to the undeserving; for being too unfeeling and for being too soft." I think if one were to try to describe the attitude of the Official Opposition with respect to the estimates that are before this House, I would think that these three short sentences read from the Annual Report pretty well summarizes the views put forward by that department. We have the wing that says we are going too fast in the field of welfare, that we're being altogether too generous in our administration of public funds; and we have the other wing in the Party that consistently says we're being too niggardly and we aren't providing for the needs of people who apply and who are our particular responsibility.

Our whole program is designed to meet need and certainly not to generate new need where need doesn't already exist. We think back in 1958 there was a great deal of need in this province that was being ignored by the Provincial Government at that particular time. I think it's very simple to cut welfare spending estimates if this is what we want to do, because all we have to do is ignore need or to be so parsimonious in our meeting need that we don't provide for the basic necessities for the people looking to us for leadership and looking to us for assistance. I think that the problems were so long ignored in the Province of Manitoba that many of them became chronic by the time we got to them, and I think that we can't solve a chronic dependency problem with one good dose of hard work, which seems to be the attitude of some of the members opposite.

One need only look at the Salter-Jarvis project to find out the kind of problems that we have to deal with in this province if we're going to make it a decent place for our children to grow up and for people to live. We have problems there that have been festering for generations, where the province and the city have shared thousands of dollars in expenditures, money down the drain because it really wasn't getting at the basic need of the people in that area - adults in that area with two and three years' education at middle age with large families, unable to hold a steady job because they didn't have the qualifications. Although they tried desperately with all of the capacity they had to maintain themselves, they were unable to.

We need only look at the Indian and Metis problem, chronic problems of culture and difference in culture which is a very real barrier for them moving into our society, and I give full marks and full credit to the Official Opposition when they were the government that they at least set up a commission to look into the problems of our Indian and Metis people.

I think we have a choice - either we can spend our money to try to solve these problems through community development or some other rehabilitative program; or we can continue to pay the high medical costs, the high hospital costs, the high cost to maintain people in jail, to maintain them on welfare. And looking at our Indian and Metis population alone, we have a report that says welfare costs for that group in the province of Manitoba would go from, I think 3 or 4 million to 12 million in a period of something like 10 years, and this isn't our responsibility, largely it's the Federal Government's responsibility. But here is a report that points the way that we're going, and if we want to get at these basic problems then we have to invest money and it's not going to be a simple job, it's going to be a big job and it's going to be a tough job. We made that choice a number of years ago and we are trying now to move towards success, and of course the other day when I was trying to read out some of the success stories that we have had in that field, some of the members of the House who claim to be interested in problems of welfare couldn't hear the discussion because of the general noise that was taking place, and you, Mr. Chairman, had to draw their attention to it.

The War on Poverty program in the United States is beginning to see some of the very real problems that we are facing here and that we are attempting to deal with here, problems of people who have grown up in a slum environment, that have so many psychological problems that taking them to technical school or basic upgrading, or whatever it is, isn't sufficient to meet their need. If they are to get out of this problem, it requires a very great deal of hard work and effort to get them back on the road to rehabilitation again.

We are tackling the problems here in Manitoba and it is very heartwarming to see some of the success stories, seeing children of mother's allowance families who are attending some of our institutions of higher education. University of Manitoba, going to teachers college, going to technical schools and succeeding in getting the kind of education that will ensure them their way in life; people with physical and mental deficiencies who are taking training courses,

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... who are getting out into employment; people in mid-life with a grade school education who are starting their life anew with this basic upgrading course followed by vocational training, on-the-job training and things of that kind. We are providing new hope and new opportunities for some of our uneconomic farmers in the province, for some of our fishermen around the lakes who are being crowded off because there aren't sufficient fish and there are too many people relying on that fishery to maintain them. These are some of the things that are being done in an attempt - in an attempt to meet the very real problems of some of our Manitobans.

Of course our welfare program has grown, because only now, only now this coming year do our estimates fully - fully provide for the full proclamation of The Social Allowances Act. We have been working towards this for some time. Our costs in 1965-66 - and I refer here to some statistics we have - for programs for the aged, the blind, the unemployed, the unemployable, child welfare and some other expenditures amounted to \$18.50 per capita, the same almost as the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of British Columbia. It's lower than the Province of Alberta, but here we are for these categories, paying \$18.50 per capita per year. Do you know what the figures are for the Dominion of Canada as a whole? The Dominion of Canada as a whole - and this is using welfare in its broadest terms, taking in family allowances, old age security payments and things of the kind - went up from \$79.00 per capita in 1956 to \$124.67 per capita in 1965. The last change in social assistance that was passed by the Government of Canada, the guaranteed income - and incidentally I am very much in favor of this program, contrary to what the Member for Emerson might believe, I am quite in favor of this program - but what does it cost? I think somebody said the other day something like 300 million and we have 20 million Canadians, that's about \$15.00 per capita, and our total expenditure for these programs I mentioned was \$18.50 for the year 1965-66, so if we want to get at the real cause of welfare costs going up, one has to look elsewhere because there are some very real pressures on welfare expenditures but they aren't all in the budget that's before the House under consideration here today.

Well I'll go back and have a look at some of the questions that have been raised. The member for Emerson said, why are welfare costs going up? I have tried to explain. He accused me of a vicious criticism of the guaranteed income supplement. I think it is a good thing; we welcome the guaranteed income supplement. It's a wonderful thing, it's going to save us some money this year. Somebody asked us how much - it's going to save us \$1 million. It's a good thing. We like to see this kind of legislation. --(Interjection)-- It is a means test program. However you want to disguise it, it's a means test program. The Member for the New Democratic Party he understands the means test program - he called it that. I agree with him, this is what it is. It's a means test. --(Interjection)-- It's a mean -- It could be considered that way. If you think it is a mean test, that's your opinion. I didn't say it was. That's your opinion.

A MEMBER: No, I was talking about yours, on Page 1150.

MR. CARROLL: On Page 150? --(Interjection)-- 1150. Oh, you asked me what my view was. I'd much sooner have seen an across-the-board payment, across-the-board payment to our elderly people with the Canada Assistance Plan and the Social Allowances Act paying the difference for those in need. That was what I indicated the other day and I still feel that.

Incidentally, the Member for Gladstone here also says I was attacking the needs test and the means test. The only reason I even mentioned this thing -- I'm going to go back and read this comment because it is so ridiculous. He says here, "One of the reasons that there is discontent and dissatisfaction in the Department of Welfare" - and I'm not aware of this and he hasn't demonstrated it to me, now maybe there is but I am not aware of it - he shakes his head. If his information on this is as good as on the other individual in welfare that he drew to the attention of the House, he's going to be pretty far wrong on it, pretty far wrong, but he says, "One of the major reasons is due to the fact that there does not seem to be any standard basic program or needs test for all categories." And then he goes on to say, "We have got one for The Social Allowances Act, one for Blind Persons Allowances, one for Disability Pension, one for Old Age Assistance," and all I pointed out was that it was the Government of Canada that established all of these other tests that we must administer because it is our responsibility to administer. And then I went on to say that "your friends in Ottawa have just established another new means test under the guaranteed income program," and that's the only reason it was raised. I certainly didn't attack it viciously as the Member for Emerson says or as the Member for

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... Gladstone would like to suggest.

Well the next question - a specific question that was asked by the Member for Gladstone - do we intend to reduce the social allowance contributions on behalf of those who receive the guaranteed income? All I want to say is refer to my opening statement on the Department of Welfare. It is fully and clearly set out, very distinctly set out because I was reading it at that time and I like to follow as closely as I can when I am making a pronouncement of that kind because it does affect a great many people and I wanted to be sure that everyone understood it fully and completely. I could go back and get my original statement and repeat it for you if you like. I rather suspect that with your keen interest in the department and its affairs, you might see fit to maybe go through it yourself. -- (Interjection)-- I'm going to read - it's on Page 975 - a friend always has his Hansards handy. I think it's the last paragraph on that page. "The Federal Guaranteed Income Program will affect many pensioners who are now receiving assistance for services under Manitoba's Social Allowances program. Accordingly, it is worth noting the essential provisions of the Federal scheme." No, that's not right, better keep going.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Are you going to decrease them or not?

MR. CARROLL: This is a little bit complicated. Actually the Canada Assistance plan requires us to take into account -- the regulations under the Canada Assistance plan requires the Province of Manitoba to take into account the guaranteed income supplement in computing social allowances. Now it's very clear.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So you are going to reduce the social allowances.

MR. HILLHOUSE: in determining a pensioner's eligibility for Canada Pension Plan, social allowance assistance paid by a province or a municipality is not included in that pensioner's income.

MR. CARROLL: Well, I'll go along to explain it a little further for my honourable friends. We are required to take the supplementary income into account in calculating social allowances. If after he has received his supplementary income of -- he's getting \$105 per month - now he's getting \$75 and a \$30 supplement. If his needs require him to get an additional supplement beyond that, then the additional supplement is not taken into account in computing the original \$30 over the \$75, but this is the way the regulations work out. In other words, let's assume that a person is in a personal care home and the cost of that home is \$175 per month. The individual gets \$75 as his only source of income, so he gets \$75 then he gets the guaranteed income supplement which gives him another \$30. He is now getting \$105; he needs \$175 so we supplement his income by \$70, and in addition to that give him a personal allowance for comforts and other essential needs. So this is the way the plan works. We are required to take it into account under the terms of the Canada Assistance plan.

Now with respect to the schedule of needs, I am sorry I haven't got a copy of our schedule of needs here. It was mentioned in our opening statement more or less. The average cost of food supplement is an additional \$5.00 per month. We are allowing an extra \$10 per month for rent under certain circumstances, and there is one other circumstance under which we can exceed even that extra \$10 per month by another \$10 so it's not an across-the-board increase; it's an increase for those who for circumstances beyond their control have to pay a higher rent for their accommodation. Then we are allowing an additional \$5.00 in comforts allowance to the socially active people in institutions, sometimes referred to as ambulant patients, but there will be some, a few possibly non-ambulant patients who will be receiving the extra supplement as well.

Now another specific question that was asked was how much can a person earn over and above the social allowance. If it's a mother's allowance and she takes a job - she wants to become active again, her children maybe are growing up to the point where they are in school and she has some time on her hands - we allow her to earn and keep an extra \$20 per month. The balance is taken into account in our calculation of her social allowance, so there is an extra \$20 available under those circumstances.

Now the only other comment that I would like to make at this stage - the Member for Portage la Prairie unfortunately is not in his seat. I wish he was because he mentioned two or three cases. Now the Province of Manitoba does not accept responsibility for the able-bodied unemployed. That's why I really can't understand this particular individual who is earning \$3,000 a year and who somehow or other qualified for some assistance from the Department of Welfare. Now if he were living in unorganized territory, in a local government district, presumably he might be our responsibility, but I rather doubt that any person who is in this

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).... kind of an income bracket would in fact be getting any assistance from us at all. He indicated that he would be prepared to give us further information on it. He was contacted by a member of our department this afternoon. He said he wasn't at liberty to disclose the information as he had got it from a friend of his in Portage la Prairie, so I think we can only say it is hearsay evidence. If he would like to provide some facts, we would be very glad to investigate it.

The other thing I would like to say is that if there is welfare abuse, I think we are the first ones that should know about it because we should certainly be the protectors and guardians of the public purse, and I'm the first one to admit that there is probably some abuse in the use of welfare funds. Usually the ones who are most keen and most quick to criticize abuse are also the ones who are most eager to criticize the number of workers that we have got, and the only way you can police this thing is to have sufficient workers who can go in and do a proper job, who can try to help these people and to try to prevent the kind of abuse that is sometimes talked about. From my own experience, whenever there are a large number of complaints of abuse in any area, we have usually tried to send somebody special into the area to investigate and run down these complaints, and it is very surprising when we find one that has substance to it. I'm not saying there aren't some - there must be - but usually there is a fabric of somebody's imagination or they hear that somebody is on welfare and this is the way the rumor starts and it can build pretty big in a very short period of time. I think that any member who raises questions of this kind in the House should certainly be prepared to stand behind the cases; he should be prepared to make the information available to the department because certainly we are the first ones who would want to hear that information and we would certainly be prepared to do something about it, so I invite the co-operation of the House to co-operate in this way in the future.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to change the subject for a moment from specific welfare cases to housing. I'm not sure whether the Minister dealt with the problem which I intend to raise during his initial remarks, and if he did so, perhaps he would just inform me immediately and I'll check them over myself. I notice that the Winnipeg Free Press of Thursday, February 9th, 1967, carried an article, "Ottawa Okays Cuts in Rents for Housing." And then it said, "Provinces may reduce payments on public units" - and I'm reading the article - "The rising cost of housing was attacked on two fronts Wednesday. In the Commons, Labour Minister Nicholson announced that provinces will be permitted by Central Mortgage and Housing to cut rents for public housing by an average of \$16 per month. Ontario immediately announced..."

MR. CARROLL: I hate to interrupt but I think this might best be discussed under the Department of Urban Affairs. This particular aspect of it is within her jurisdiction. If it's elderly and infirm persons housing, then I have the responsibility for that, but not for housing in general.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I respect the Honourable Minister's interruption - my problem and the intention that I had for raising this was that I didn't think that it would apply to elderly persons housing and the announcement is rather encouraging in that it later goes on to say, "The minimum rent for families with a monthly income of \$192 or less is slashed to \$32 from \$51 for serviced units." Now if this is correct, Mr. Chairman, I think that many people who are in the Minister's Department would be entitled to considerable rent relief and I think that they would be encouraged to know that the Province of Manitoba is following the good example of the Province of Ontario in doing this. This, Mr. Chairman, is one area where the province certainly can't call the Federal Government to task, and if the Federal Government, of which I am not a great friend, has made this available and that it will result in considerable relief to people who are on low and fixed incomes, then I think that the sooner the Province of Manitoba announces that these people are to be encouraged by future lower rents, the happier they'll feel about it and that the announcement should come very quickly.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I think that this kind of relief is sometimes far more effective than the increasing of allowances. I know that with regard to old age pensioners, in particular those who occupy self-contained units, that the standard result of an increase in old age pension or old age assistance allowances has been a corresponding increase in rents, so that the landlords who house these people and who are immediately made publicly aware of the increase that they are getting, automatically and for years have passed this increase on to their particular tenants. So, Mr. Chairman, I would make the statement that the \$75 allowance that the old age pensioner receives now, I don't think is much more than the initial old age pension allowance which they received some time back in 1926 which at that time

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... was \$25, so that the provision of public housing with the interest of the tenants being involved can result in a decrease in rent and therefore a real betterment of their living conditions, and if the Minister has any encouraging remarks to make to these people now concerning the rental on these units, and I'm referring particularly to people in elderly public housing units, I think that that remark would indeed be encouraging to these people.

MR. CARROLL: I should possibly speak just at the moment, because I wouldn't want any of our elderly people living in these units to be led to believe that there might be a reduction with respect to the housing units that are under our control. Actually, these are built, as I understand it, under a different section of the National Housing Act. They are not subsidized housing in the normal sense of the word. There is no Federal contribution at all towards the construction of these homes. The only subsidy involved is the provincial capital grant. The Federal Government merely acts as the financier and provides the mortgage money to carry them through. I am quite sure though that the Minister of Urban Affairs will want to make note of that. I know that there are some changes expected in this whole housing field and I hope that we may be able to take more advantage of this kind of thing in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows was on his feet.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the Honourable Minister of Welfare a couple of questions arising out of comments that he has made tonight and my first one is related to comments he had made, but it arises primarily out of some of the statistical data appearing in the report. The report shows that there is a fair number of applicants for social welfare of various types coming under the control of the eight various pieces of legislation and a certain number are denied assistance.

Now my concern is about those who are denied assistance. Are they by and large - or let me put the question in this way - the people who are denied assistance, are they primarily of a type who really should not receive assistance because they could find other ways and means of supporting themselves adequately, or are they primarily of a type who are denied assistance because their particular case, their circumstances do not fall four square within the confines of the rules and regulations and the legislation providing for assistance. In other words, a person may come along for assistance, but because he fails to meet certain requirements or his unfortunate condition may not be of a type that qualifies him for assistance, and therefore the government says "no" to him.

That leads to a second question. What is the fate of these people who are denied assistance? Do they simply mark time and hopefully wait for the day when there may be a change in the staff officer for their locality, at which time they may apply afresh, or are they directed to employment or to some other sources of help or whatever type of help may be necessary to get themselves on their feet and thus make themselves self-sustaining citizens.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I'm more concerned about what is done for the people who apply but are denied assistance than I am for the amounts of money that are expended on the various types of welfare allowances. I appreciate that there is need to provide adequate welfare allowance, but here again I wish to repeat and no doubt the Honourable Minister will agree with me, that the success of this department lies not in paying out sums of money in the form of social allowances but basically in the preventative area which he himself had mentioned. In other words, the more cases that his department could assist in rehabilitating themselves, the greater the degree of success of his department.

There are mentioned in the debate that welfare assistance is frequently or at times abused, and the Honourable Minister did state that there could be abuse at times and he had mentioned that the only remedy for this is the provision of sufficient workers. Now is the Honourable Minister suggesting that he does not have adequate staff to do the type of work that ought to be done? Before that comment was made, I had thought of asking the Honourable Minister this question and I will still put it to him. I would like him to comment on the adequacy of the professional staff that he has in his department - by professional staff I am referring to social workers and whatever other professional staff he needs to do an effective job - and I would like to know how the caseload of the social workers in his department compares with the accepted average in the profession, how it compares with the recommended average that may be prescribed by the Social Workers Association or whatever body there is speaking for the social workers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the member proceeds I think I should draw to the attention of the Committee that we have now spent 6-1/2 hours on the Minister's salary, on welfare, and I think I should point out further that we have just completed two departments - there are 15 departments yet to complete and we have spent 43-1/2 hours at this point. We are limited to 80 hours so I hope that the members will take this into consideration when they get up to answer questions and make their speeches.

The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. The Honourable Minister just mentioned a little while ago that as far as the housing for physically handicapped it's at the bottom of his list, so it seems to me that he seems to be inclined to believe that there is no need in the province which, as far as I know, is contrary to the information that I am receiving.

The question that I would really like to get from him now is how many low rental, self-contained units for couples and families and for single persons have been built last year for the physically handicapped. I would like to get that information.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): I was just going to mention, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps if the members hadn't spent the weekend in The Pas they wouldn't have been so interested in welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Chairman, the physically handicapped -- well, frankly, we have built very few what we call "personal care homes" because as you know there was a change in the statute two years ago to enable us to provide grants for personal care homes, and frankly we've been a long time in negotiations with interested sponsors for the provision of personal care homes. We have built at the present time, I think it's 64 at the Convalescent Home with an addition of I believe 25 that's under construction at the present time and soon to be finished; there are 100 new units being provided by the Seventh Day Adventists in the City of Transcona which will be available within the next month or two. These are the only -- I'm sorry, there have been 48 that have been converted from hostel to personal care home in the town of The Pas. I'm sorry I hadn't known you were interested; I might have taken you over to see that facility. This was converted because of certain emergency situations that developed and very keen demand for this kind of accommodation. So I think that's really about all I can say except that the accommodation for the physically handicapped isn't at the bottom of our list. All I really mean to say is that it hasn't been at the top of our list. There have been very keen demands that we've been trying to meet. Some of these personal care homes will provide accommodation for physically handicapped people and we are in negotiation now with at least three major sponsors for very large developments, one at Hospice Tache, Holy Family Home, and Middlechurch, all of which will be very substantial undertakings when they are ultimately developed.

Now if I could just go back for a moment, I understand that the main reason why people are turned down - in answer to the question from the Member for Burrows - is because of excess assets; elderly people who may have a bond in the bank or some cash on deposit, or some other assets which prevent him from becoming eligible. This is the main reason for turning people down. For those who are turned down who feel that they have been wrongly turned down, then we have an appeal board, and we have something like I believe 20 to 24 cases per year going before the appeal board. Some of them are acceded to. Most of them, I believe, support the department in refusing assistance. I would be very glad to give you a report on our appeal board if you would like to hear that, a little later in the debate.

We of course have responsibility for the able-bodied unemployed only in Unorganized Territory, Local Government Districts and so on, so in these areas we do turn down people. If there's work available anywhere in the area, then assistance is not normally provided to the able-bodied unemployed unless there is some emergency situation that requires assistance. Usually they must accept whatever employment is available if there's any within the area at all.

We do try to direct people who have problems that we can't meet. Let's assume for a moment that they don't meet our particular areas of responsibility, we do attempt to direct them to other agencies - the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, or whatever other agency may be able to provide the kind of assistance that the individual needs. The Member for Brokenhead pointed out that one of the cases in which he was interested had not been referred from the Disability Allowance Board on to our Social Allowance Program. It is the

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) . . . policy of our department and the Pensions Branch to do that. Unfortunately this young lady, or whoever it was, was not aware of the policy, or did not follow it for some reason in the case that he was interested in. However, this is our policy and we do try to follow that as the usual procedure.

I think the department is as well staffed now as it has ever been since I became the Minister. I think we have a fairly good percentage of professionally trained staff in relation to the non-professional workers. I recall a couple of years ago reading an article by the former national Secretary of Health and Welfare in which he was commenting on trained social workers in the United States, and I think this percentage of trained workers in the United States was somewhere around four percent of those engaged in direct contact with the public in the welfare field. We have a substantially better relationship and percentage in the Province of Manitoba. We also have in-staff, on-the-job training programs that try to keep our professional staffs, try to give them more experience, better experience. We also have a training program for our non-professionals, our welfare workers. We also now are relying on graduates from our technical school in Brandon who have a very excellent course at below the professional level to train people to help us with our caseloads.

Another thing, we do try to grade our caseloads. We have within the department some staff members who will be handling as many as 150 or 175 cases because they're easy cases to handle. They are mainly financial assistance without too many of the other problems that require the services of professionally trained staff and, as you may know, down in the Salter-Jarvis area the caseload was very low because we were dealing with multi-problem families and our case workers there were on call 24 hours a day, and I suspect worked substantially longer than the normal 40-hour week that is put in by most provincial civil servants. They would often work 50 to 60 hours a week as they were required to work, even though they had a very small caseload. These people were doing a very special job with very difficult families and we think it paid off for a good many of them.

So I think we have a very good balance. It may not be as good as our Director of Welfare and others would like but certainly we're trying to build and to keep a good, trained staff.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken too much time in this debate - only about five minutes - and I propose to take maybe another five minutes right now. I think that the Minister's trouble stems from the fact that a few years ago another Minister made a statement: "No one shall suffer for want of the ordinary necessities of life." A nice phrase, a beautiful phrase, and I to a certain extent agree with that phrase or with the sentence, or whatever you may call it, but I'm afraid too many people in the Province of Manitoba took this literally for what it means; in other words, allowed themselves, "Well, why should I work? The government's going to protect me. The government will make sure that I do not suffer for want of the ordinary necessities of life," and I think that's where the mistake is. It wasn't fully explained and a lot of people are taking advantage of that with the leniency that they expect from the present government.

Now the Minister objected to the word that I used, "viciously attack." I didn't mean that he used profane language or language that probably it's not proper to use in this House, but he did attack that plan and I'll just read some of the statements that he made, and here is one: "His friends in Ottawa" - because he should blame his friends in Ottawa because they are the ones who are adding to this confusion - "they have got another means test, a test so if my honourable friend wants a means test, that's what he's got." This is what everybody's been arguing against. "If he wants a means test." That means the Minister himself is against a means test or a needs test. - and I don't care what you call it. I've just been asking for more careful screening.

Then further down it says again: "Mr. Carroll: I think that . . ." I'll read the whole sentence. "Well, if you'd like my views on it. . . ." (it was asked by -- it says here: "Mr. Shoemaker: Will you give us your views on it.") "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." Well, it's as plain as daylight. He doesn't like the way Ottawa intends to screen the needy from the needy, and I've never proposed that there would be an increase in welfare spending and I've never proposed more welfare spending at any time, and I don't think I could be accused of it. But on the other hand I do not want the underprivileged to suffer, just like he says, "for want of ordinary necessities of life," but just the underprivileged. I do not want to see the aged or the people in need, the maimed, the crippled or the destitute suffer, but I'm against some of those who are taking welfare payments, or taking

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) advantage of welfare and they do not deserve it. I always subscribe to that principle; "Take care of the needy," and I repeat that every year in this House, but not the greedy - and I don't care what you call it. Call it means test, needs test - to me they're both the same. There's not too much difference in that, but I say we have to screen the greedy from the needy because for every dollar that's spent on welfare some individual in this province has to dish that dollar out. In other words, we've got to have the good Samaritans and as I said before, if we're not careful how we spend our welfare dollar we probably will be strangling this good Samaritan in the very near future.

I think it is time that someone spoke for the individual who is still willing to work and to pay and not just to play and to take, and through the government has done this to a certain extent, but I would like to have more emphasis placed on rehabilitating some of these people who cannot take care of themselves, because I believe that most of the people who are on welfare would rather not be on welfare; they would rather go off relief and become self-supporting. I think that that's what our aim should be; we should provide some incentive for work. I think these people should be permitted to earn some money, even those who are presently recipients of any kind of welfare. They should be permitted to earn some money above what they are getting now, because I feel that the allowances that most of these people do get at the present time just sustains them at -- well they are just at the bare subsistence level so if they could earn a few dollars and thus improve their standard of living I don't think that we should be too strict with them.

I thought that the Minister - up till now I thought it was \$25.00 that they were permitted; the Minister just told us it was \$20.00 that they are permitted to earn above what they are receiving, and after that their welfare is being decreased. I don't see why the provincial Welfare Department shouldn't adopt a plan similar to the Security Plan that Ottawa has worked out. Let the person earn \$25.00 and deduct nothing from his welfare, because he probably needs it, but anything above the \$25.00 why not deduct \$1.00 for every \$2.00, and I think this would be an incentive to the people to work. I just sat down here and worked out a little - did a little figuring. Supposing a person's receiving \$100.00 welfare and this one goes out and earns another \$75.00. Therefore the total income would be \$175.00. Now I use the \$25.00 that the province permits him to earn, therefore the recipient would still get \$150.00, but by the same token the welfare payment would be reduced by \$25.00. In other words, the province saves \$25.00 and there's an incentive for that person to go out and earn more because he'd still be able to keep at least half. Say if he earns \$125.00, he'll better himself by \$75.00 and the province will save \$50.00. Then if he earns \$220.00 according to the new, \$220.00, the province will be scot free and the province will not have to pay anything. If you use that same principle, and it's a good principle -- the Minister did indicate that maybe he didn't say that he is against the principle, against the screening of this. I think that in this instance the government should be happier, the recipient should be happier, if that was permitted, and there would be an incentive and the people of Manitoba would be happier.

I don't subscribe to this that we can go ahead and dole welfare out without proper screening, so means test or needs test, we have to have it. I'll say feed the sick, the maimed, the crippled and so on, but it nauseates me - I'm nauseated by these do-nothings who will not take a job even if you drove them in a Cadillac to and from the job, and I know what I'm talking of because I have complaints and I have letters here. I know of one employer who has asked a man, a certain man, to come and work. He says, "Why should I work? I'm on relief now and I like it that way." But a few days later this same person came back to the manager: "Could I get a job? Is it still open?" And the employer was very happy. He said, "Yes, you can get a job." "Oh, yes" he says, "but I want to work only one day. One day, that's all I want to work." "Why one day?" he says. "Oh, I've got to take a friend to a bingo game and I haven't got enough money." There you go. He could have worked more than one day but didn't seem to have any incentive. He wanted to earn a few dollars so he could go to a bingo game.

I think that Manitobans, most of them, are really -- some of these bearded bums who won't work, who tramp the picket lines and who see no evil in Castro and Viet Cong but they sneer at the free enterprise and at capitalism - those people who say that. They see no evil in Castro and Viet Cong; they think that these people, the free enterprises and capitalists, are a threat to peace. I don't agree with that. Manitoba is tired, I would say, of all those people who demand, who knock down capitalism and free enterprise, but at the same time most of them are right there with their hands out to be the first ones to take advantage of this free enterprise and capitalism that we are in here, and I am sick of those. I think Manitoba is fed

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd) up with those who claim that they are presenting new ways in life; they sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity and morality, the way our country has been built up, and I am proud of that. And I say to the government, make sure that the welfare dollar is spent properly, that it is spent on the needy and not on the greedy.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the last speaker would permit a question - I didn't hear all he said just recently. Was he referring to people on the picket lines as being in this group that he describes - that he felt nauseated him?

MR. TANCHAK: It's people I said who won't work, who won't work.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the picket lines?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes on the picket lines and on the sit-ins. Those who won't work. There are some on the picket lines who will work and wish to work, but those who don't want to work and there are plenty of them. . . .

MR. CARROLL: You know, it's almost unbelievable what you hear in this House sometimes. You know, he says, "Make sure the welfare money is not wasted." He knows of some people who are getting welfare who refused jobs. I say he has a responsibility to come and tell us about it. You have a responsibility as a member of this House to go and tell the issuing authority where you see cases of welfare abused. Now how many able-bodied do we have on assistance? We may have some down in your country. We did a study of it a few years ago and we found, at a time when some people were telling us we had lots of people on assistance, we found we had nobody in the particular area from which the criticism had come, and if this is provincial assistance granted by a provincial authority and you know of abuse, I am the first one that wants to know about it. I would welcome you to come and I don't think you have come yet. You've been sitting in this House now for some nine years with me and I don't think I recall you ever having reported a case of abuse in the period of time in which I have been the Minister of Welfare. Now I would welcome you to do that instead of raising these questions in the House and suggesting that this is a common procedure. --(Interjection)-- What precise . . . does a member of this House have? Does he not have a responsibility to protect the treasury?

MR. DESJARDINS: Not to spy, that's for sure.

MR. CARROLL: Oh yes, you don't want to spy on them. There's a man who talks out of both sides of his mouth at once. He's the first one to say that welfare expenses are too high and that people are getting too much money on welfare, and who is the man who comes and pleads -- you know, the most cases with me for a little special favour for people that he's interested in? He's done it on several occasions that I'm aware of, where he has come to us saying, "Please help my people; they're not getting enough. They want some little special feature; they want to go into this home over here," or whatever, and the first man to get up and criticise welfare abuse.

MR. DESJARDINS: Who?

MR. CARROLL: You.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if he's referring to me, I haven't said a word in this estimate yet, so

MR. CARROLL: No you haven't, that's true.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well make up your mind.

MR. CARROLL: You made a remark in this House a couple of weeks ago that people on welfare were doing pretty well thank you, and this happened to be at a time when you were making some special appeal to me for some person in which you had an interest.

Now the member for Gladstone is suggesting here that because our Social Allowance Act says and spells out as a statement of principle that no one should suffer, no one should be denied the necessities of life, that this has in fact prevented able-bodied men from going to work. Is this what you are suggesting? Because this is the way I seem to read it, that you are suggesting that able-bodied men -- do they go to their municipality for assistance or is this in an area where they would normally come to the province? I would like to know this because there are all kinds of insinuations coming from over there. Once again I would just like to mention for your benefit, I like the guaranteed income plan. It's a wonderful thing. We are receiving great benefits from it here in Manitoba. I am not highly critical of it. My only comment arose from the fact that somebody thought we had too many tests in Manitoba and I said, "ah ha, and here is another one supported by your friends in Ottawa."

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) The question of some kind of an incentive for people getting assistance. I think this is a very important thing and I think we've tried to provide it. There comes a point, however, when you have to draw the line, otherwise the Department of Welfare is merely subsidizing low wages in the Province of Manitoba, and this certainly isn't the function of a department of welfare. The Department of Welfare is sort of a last resort for people who don't have the ability, who for reasons beyond their control have to lean on someone else for support, and this is the role that we are trying to provide and to perform here, and I certainly don't think that we are providing the needy - or the greedy, rather, instead of the needy, and I would certainly welcome members of the House to report any such cases where they feel there is welfare abuse, to either myself or members of our department.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Honourable Minister is inviting me to be his deputy minister by asking me to go ahead and help him in his department. I am not getting \$22,000 a year and I would say that that is his responsibility, and all I'm trying to point out to him is that he should be more careful or instruct the people concerned in his department to be more careful in screening, because there is abuse of it, and there are many. I am not going to be a stool pigeon running up to the Minister and complaining.

MR. CARROLL: I'm just asking you to be responsible, not a stool pigeon.

MR. TANCHAK: But it is your responsibility, not mine. It is your responsibility, and I was not referring to my own constituency. I am lucky to say, and the Minister just said, that in my own constituency there is very little of that. Very little of that and I was not referring

MR. CARROLL: There is very little in any other part of the province too and I want you to know that.

MR. TANCHAK: In my constituency there are very little people on welfare, except mothers and so on, on Mothers Allowance. But there are other places who are and I'm not going to be a stool pigeon unless the Honourable

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. A few moments ago the Minister of Health handed me a package of acid pills. I did not wish to appear to be going sour a few moments ago when I asked the cooperation of the committee to proceed with the work of the estimates, but I don't think this type of exchange is really getting us any place. I would ask all the members to proceed

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has forced me to get into this debate. I didn't intend to. He asked the honourable member to bring in some facts. Now my suggestion to the Honourable Minister of Welfare is that when their help goes out into the rural areas to check on welfare cases, that before they permit these cases to go on welfare that either the mayor or the reeve of the municipality should be asked if they are eligible. I can prove to you that last year a man, a retired farmer, came into Russell, built a new house and was driving a new car, and got on welfare. Now if there is any rhyme or reason to that then I'm a Dutchman. It was soon stopped when the town got to know about it and they only found out through the cheques coming through the mail. Now whoever the welfare helper was who was foolish enough to agree to this I don't know his or her name, but surely, if these cases in the various towns were brought to the council's attention before they were granted, this would stop a lot of this stuff; save you a lot of headaches I'm sure, and it's only a suggestion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement or insinuated a while ago that I was trying to get special privileges for any of my constituents. I'd invite him to prove this point right now or to withdraw these remarks. At any time that I have asked him anything I have asked him if there was any - I'd mention a few cases to him - I have asked him if there was anything, if these people had any right, qualified under any program, and I would like him to deny this if he will. If not, I think that he should withdraw the statement he has made. Now the last time that I talked to him, if the Chairman would like to know what I talked to him about, it was somebody that didn't even live in my constituency. It was a lady that lived in St. Vital, and, to give a little bit of information to my honourable friend, it was a member of his staff that told me and told me that there was nothing that could be done as far as the provincial government was concerned. This is a woman whose husband had been jailed for nine months because he was beating her up and he received nine months. I am told that if he had received 12 months she would have qualified for some assistance under the province. Then she is a cripple in a wheelchair with two children, and she was receiving the maximum allowed under the city of St. Vital at the time. That was \$12.50; \$12.50 for herself and two children. And I brought this up to my honourable friend and the next step, when he told me

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) there was nothing he could do about it, I suggested to the honourable member -- and I think that he'll answer to this, that he can back me on this, the Member from St. Vital, who I suggested maybe should be able to take this up with the council of the City of St. Vital or some service club and so on, and I think that my honourable friend did this. So any statement this Minister will make I think he should be careful and not try and insinuate other things at all. There is not once that I have not given the name of the people and everything that I was asked, and many times I also commented myself that I told the people I didn't think that they should qualify. Is this right or isn't this right? And I don't think that it's right for him to come here and make a campaign speech - he hasn't answered half of the questions that we have asked; we're asking for a schedule. Is that so difficult to obtain? Why can't my honourable friend from Gladstone get an idea of your policy? Why? I'd like to know why. What is your policies? We have asked you your policies - are you going to reduce now that the Federal Government has given another grant. You look at us as if this is well, what a question, and I remember a few years ago we debated this, that the Federal Government granted another \$10.00 to the people that needed it and you took it away from them. So I think that when we are dealing with estimates, I think that my honourable friend certainly not only has the right but the duty to tell you what was wrong. My honourable friend read a quotation from somebody in his department that said either you want to give him too much or some don't want to give them enough. That will apply all the time, and that doesn't mean if you question -- I'd be the first one to say that this lady in St. Vital, this crippled woman in a wheelchair with two children, I don't think that's enough, but I do think that there's an awful lot spent that shouldn't be spent, but not once did I ask my honourable friend for any special favours, and I wish that he could correct this because he's certainly off base when he insinuated in this House that this is what I did.

Now, of any other comments that I said, something about the committee on welfare, I would like you to find Hansard like it's usually done if you are going to remark anything that I've said. All I said is about the work of the North when my honourable friend said that they were so anxious of helping the people of the north and I asked him if the way they give certain -- they allow, the bids on this construction up there. I asked him if this was what he was proud of, of getting people from Alberta, all the work done, even the painting, every single bit of work done in a \$2 million contract. This is the only thing that I said about welfare. I haven't said another word before but now that I'm on my feet I would like to ask him a few questions.

First of all, I would like to tell him a little bit about the adoption. I have never seen so many questions. You were talking about detectives and people prying in your life, it's when a family, an ordinary family tries to adopt somebody. We are told that there are so many of these children that have no homes and we are asking -- the questions. It's practically impossible at times, and it's so long, to be able to adopt children. Families that are willing to give love and to me that should be the important thing. We have to find out how old they are and all kinds of personal questions. Do we do this when people apply for a licence to get married? Do we say, "No, you're too old. If you get a child at this stage of the game maybe you'll die and the child would be too young"? Do we do this? I agree that we have to ask certain questions but I think that we should re-study the situation. I think we are being carried away with trying to protect these children. I think the main thing is to give them a little bit of love and there's a lot of people that are ready and willing and able to give this love but they are delayed and delayed and they're subject to all kinds of personal questions, sometimes insulting questions, and I have letters to prove that. My honourable friend has some also. I think this is something we've mentioned in the last two years, something that you should look into.

Another thing is, I've asked for a number of years now, that we have the administration of all beds, hospital beds, all kinds of hospitals under the Department of Health. Now whenever I ask this question I'm told we are co-operating with the Department of Welfare, and this is under the Department of Welfare and I have yet to hear the Minister of Welfare say one word about this, about the administration of the geriatric hospitals, about the waiting list there, about what you do to get on the list, and have they enough beds? Instead of making these big long speeches about ideals, and a political speech, and ask the different members from this side to help him by running around the province spying on whoever is collecting from welfare, which is an assinine suggestion, a ridiculous suggestion. We're not here for that at all. And I wonder if he'd listen to us if we did bring this information. If we have any facts, any letters that's read, you table, - you ask us

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) to table these things, and we could bring in certain suggestions like my honourable friend said, the last speaker - he gave you an example. It doesn't mean that the Honourable Minister is blamed personally for all these things. We are here to talk about policies and if you weren't so vague in your statement, if you gave us a bit of your policies, answer yes or no, some of the answers. My honourable friend here has been asking questions for three days and I don't think you have answered any one of them at all except by making more statements and then getting up and suggesting that I'm asking for privileges for the people of my constituency, which you know is absolutely wrong. I think if my honourable friend would restrict himself at this stage of the game to trying to answer the questions it would be a lot better for the people of Manitoba and it would be a lot easier for his department.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think I'd better just apologize. I didn't mean to imply that he was asking for special treatment for his cases. I must confess he has usually pressed pretty vigorously when he's brought a case to me for fair treatment on the part of the department. I must confess I think that's really all he's ever asked for. He hasn't asked for any special consideration. The comment that I was referring to was during another debate in this House in which we were talking about someone who was doing fairly well up in the Inlaker country and I understood my honourable friend to say something - "He must be living on welfare," and that registered with me. If he says he didn't say it -- I know it wasn't recorded

MR. DESJARDINS: to show me the quote, the page in Hansard that I said

MR. CARROLL: It wasn't in Hansard. It was an interjection that my honourable friend made in debate, the same as I do on occasion when I maybe shouldn't but I apologize for any implication or any suggestion that I may have made in my earlier remarks.

With respect to the questions that are asked, I think that all of the questions and all of the investigation that takes place with respect to adoption is only to ensure that the child gets the best home possible, and these investigations do involve meeting with the various people who provide references, meeting sometimes with friends or neighbours who know the couple well. We aren't concerned about a little bit of love; we want a lot of love for that child. We want the best home possible for it. I think this is the only reason why we go through all of these procedures through the Director of Child Welfare to try to ensure that the child gets the best home possible.

With respect to geriatric hospitals, I have some responsibility for infirm persons housing. We normally refer to them as personal care homes. We work very closely with the Minister of Health through our Care Services Organization which I think is providing a very valuable service to the people of Manitoba. The last figure I seem to recall was two or three months ago when we had a waiting list I believe of 105 waiting for placement in care of some kind. We have 125 beds that are nearing completion at the present time. We don't pretend to be satisfied. We started late with this program because we felt that this was the final gap to round out the plan between the hospital plan down through personal care to hostels and ultimately housing at the bottom end. So this is the last area that we have taken into consideration. We believe that we're headed in the right direction. We're certainly not delaying the construction of any of these homes at the present time; we're trying to speed up the planning as best we can.

With respect to the specific questions raised by your seat mate to which he has not received answers, he gets copies of the Gazette; he's in this building every day and he could go and get the Order-in-Council. I'm sorry that I haven't filed the actual list with him. I've given him the broad general understanding. I haven't told him exactly how much an 18-year old boy will get in relation to how much an adult will get. The specific details aren't there but in general he knows the policy. I'd be very happy to give him the balance of the information tomorrow.

With respect to the member for Birtle-Russell consulting with the local mayor and council. Maybe these are the best people to talk to. I don't know, but I rather suspect that we ride pretty heavily on the judgment of local people in many cases. Now it could be the mayor in some cases; it could be members of council in other cases; but usually we rely on people in that community if we need additional information, if we need a judgment on a person; if we're unsure of their particular status. We do try to rely on local people to some extent. This doesn't mean that a person who purposely tries to conceal his eligibility, his lack of eligibility from us. If he has a bank account in Brandon and he has one in Birtle, we will

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) . . . normally look at the bank in Birtle, examine his account and make such other searching questions and investigation as we can, but a person who sets out to conceal to hide something from us, it's very difficult for us to find out. We usually find out in time, and I have had some complaints from the Birtle-Russell area. I have not had one complaint yet from anybody that hasn't been investigated by the department. Now we may, we sometimes find out that that individual is right. Quite often we find out they're not right. But there has been a great deal of cooperation from other people. We do try to rely on local people where we can and this is the policy that we would hope to continue.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said tonight by the Minister with respect to the Guaranteed Income Supplement. In one breath he would refer to it as an excellent scheme and in the next breath he would refer to it as being based on a means test. Now I'd like to point out to this committee that that scheme is not based on a means test; that scheme is based on income. It is a guaranteed income supplement. It is not based upon the assets of the individual excepting insofar as these assets reflect dividends or profits. Now our scheme here in the Old Age Assistance, it is based on a means test. If that individual has any money in the bank the amount of that money in the bank is correlated to the annuity that that money would buy between that person's age and the date that that person would receive Old Age Security. If they have a home there's an arbitrary figure of approximately five percent taken on the value of that home which is considered to be income. Now under this federal scheme of Guaranteed Income Supplement, the assets of that person are not considered at all excepting insofar as they are income-bearing, and I'd like to point out here that in the statement of income that an individual has to fill out in order to qualify for this pension, it says, "Do not include any of the following in your statement of income: Old Age Security pensions and any similar provincial payment; social assistance payments from municipal, provincial or federal government; or veterans' allowances; or civilian war allowances; dependent parent's pension; disability or widow's pension based on war service; private disability insurance payments; Workmen's Compensation; Unemployment Insurance benefits; money received from selling any of your possessions or investments. In addition to these items there may be other pensions similar to those mentioned above which are also not taxable. If you are in doubt as to whether any pension you receive should be included or not, please ask about this when you send in your application."

Now I have filled out, during the last two or three days I have filled out about 24 of these applications in my own office, and I can say here without fear of contradiction that each one of these individuals whose application was filled out at my office, is going to qualify for the full amount of this pension, and some of these individuals do own homes that are assessed at eight, ten, twelve thousand dollars. They also have money in the bank. They also have mortgage payments. Now none of these things are taken into consideration in determining that person's income excepting the interest that they get on it. Now when the Honourable Minister refers to this as a means test, all I suggest to him is that he compare the test that is made under this scheme with the test that is made under the Old Age Security, and he'll see the difference.

This is an excellent scheme. It's based on a person's income, not on their assets, excepting insofar as these assets reflect income, and I think that's something that should be taken into consideration here. Now I thought I'd keep the record straight by just showing what is included here. We don't include what we include when we are making up an application for Old Age Assistance. You include every asset that that person has and that asset is taken into consideration as a reflection of income. But not so here. The only thing that's taken into consideration in reflection of income excepting those items I have mentioned here, is the actual earnings that you have from that investment.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on the question of adoption the Minister said that all they're interested in is not only a little bit of love but to give these children a lot of love. What happens if a moron wants to get married here in Manitoba? He gets a licence and gets married. What would stop him getting a licence if he's not already married and if he doesn't suffer a certain disease? A man can marry a widow with 10 children. He could be a drunkard; he could be anything; but he'll marry this widow with 10 children. This is all right. Who takes care of the children? Who's thinking about love in this instance?

MR. CARROLL: The mother.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, the mother. Yes. We've had a lot of examples of broken homes and what happens to some of them if the mother can take care of all this. I just give as an

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) indication of what my honourable friend knows about it. The mother cannot. If she has a husband that doesn't cooperate I can see how much love that these children will have.

Now I'm not suggesting for a minute that there shouldn't be any study, any qualification. I'm not saying this at all. I'm suggesting that maybe we go a little too far; we go a little bit too far with all these queries, these personal questions that we're asked to give - sleep with the bottom or the top of your pyjamas, and other crazy things you have to know, about the sexual habits of the people and so on. And I think that this is exaggerated because there's too many of those children that could receive some love. We're not taking the same care when we issue a licence to give permission for somebody to get married, and I'm suggesting that we can let some of those children receive some love instead of being in institutions, and I think they would be a way better off. We're asking for the impossible; we're asking for perfection, and we're practically insulting some of the people that find in their heart that they have room and they want to take care of a child. They don't care what it is. . . . example of people being asked, "What do you want, a boy or a girl?" They said, "We didn't know we had a choice. Oh well, I guess it's a boy." Then later on they ask again. Well no, we only have a girl, then you are not ready to adopt anybody because you only wanted a boy, and questions like this. I am suggesting that we are exaggerating, that there are too many questions. Let's get back to things a little bit normal and give more of these children a home and let's not take six, seven, eight months until these people are discouraged, before we tell them if they qualify or not.

My honourable friend wanted to enlist 57 spies a while back to find out the people who shouldn't be on welfare. Well, I think by saying this he is just admitting that his program is not working, and I wonder if he'd look back a few years ago when this government changed their policy, and I wonder if he doesn't think that maybe we should go back to letting the administration of welfare be done on the local level, municipal level, with people that have a better chance of knowing their own people. If this is what we want - a police, a police state - I think that you wouldn't need this; we would have the different social workers working for different municipalities, working for different cities, as well as the aldermen also and the mayor of these different municipalities and I think that there would be less duplication in what we are doing now in this department, in this field of welfare. What is the increase -- the honourable member from Lakehead told you a few days ago how many more people you had working for you and there is no --(Interjection)-- oh, Lakeside - Flee Island. Anyway, I don't think that there's any reduction of these welfare people working for the different municipalities. And I think that this would be, if the Honourable Minister admits that things are so bad in his department, I think that maybe he should study the possibility of going back to the old system, which worked quite well. Certainly there were less - yes, it did work quite well. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

. continued on next page

MR. CARROLL: Ask the old people how well it worked.

MR. DESJARDINS: Which old people? I think it worked a lot better than it does now, because you had people that knew the problems. I think there was way less abuse than there is now and I think that they might try to help somebody by maybe going a little further in certain cases, and I think that there was an awful lot more cooperation then than we have now. Half the money is spent on wages in this department and we are being told that they are behind; this was the main reason, going back to adoption again, you were so far behind. It took a year to find out if you'd qualify or not. I think that the government would be well advised to look into the possibility of letting the administration be taken care of by the municipalities. I think that it would be much better.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken part too much in the discussion on the Department of Welfare estimates, other than a few remarks on the Minister's salary at the commencement, but the last speaker certainly aroused my interest in the philosophy of helping people out, and I want to ask my honourable friend if this is his personal opinion or party opinion or what? The reason I ask this, Mr. Chairman, I once had an opportunity under the set-up that my honourable friend from St. Boniface thinks we should go back to, and I say "Back" with a great big capital B, because if the Province of Manitoba in the field of welfare wants to go back, then I suggest to the Minister of Welfare that he should adopt the suggestion of the Member for St. Boniface, but I hope, Mr. Chairman, for the well-being of our unfortunate citizens in the Province of Manitoba, that the Minister of Welfare and the government of today rejects completely the suggestion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. JOHNSON: Ag reps taking welfare applications.

MR. PAULLEY: Not only ag reps - municipal councillors taking them, who have absolutely, in most cases, no idea as to what people need or what they really are entitled to. I know, because I was once the mayor of a municipality and we had a difficult situation at all times for trying to receive requests for aid and we, generally speaking, were influenced not by a great deal of knowledge as to the personal well-being of the individuals but on the basis of ifs, buts and ands. At least the ifs, buts and ands; and this is the one thing, if it is the only thing, that I do give the present government of Manitoba credit for in the field of welfare, because Lord forbid, Mr. Chairman, to ever place the people who are in need of assistance in the position of going, cap in hand, once more back to a municipal council. At least impersonally now they can make applications for aid. All of the whole municipality doesn't have to know it today, that a person is in dire circumstances or in need as they did under the previous scheme, and I'm surprised, very much surprised, to hear a member of this House, no matter where he sits, suggest that we should turn the clock back in Manitoba in respect of aiding our people out. Surely to goodness every one of us, as members of this Legislature, have had from time to time people come to us, indicate their circumstances, and all that is necessary today is to get in touch with the Department of Welfare and then a social worker investigates the case, and if the case is justified then aid is forthcoming. I have had a number of letters, Mr. Chairman, from all quarters in Manitoba of requests from individuals who are down on their luck and temporarily and financially embarrassed, and all that I have done is to say to the department, "Will you kindly look into the case of Mr. and Mrs. so and so," or whatever the status of the person may be; I have received a reply from the Department, and in due course I know that a survey is being made by the department as to the needs.

Previously, under the old system, it wouldn't have been that at all. It would be that I would have had to refer the person back to a municipal council, who may not be available. It might have been referred back even to a person in my own position and we would have to look into the inner sanctum of Jow Blow, and then finally, in accordance with the budget, in many cases, of the municipality, decide what they were going to receive as far as allowances were concerned.

We fault the government, and I fault them too today, because I don't think that their allowances in many respects are sufficient to meet what they call the needs on a means test. But to return back to what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is suggesting, Mr. Chairman, would be to turn back to where almost every municipality in the whole of the Province of Manitoba had a different welfare allowance schedule, where in one municipality a person might receive \$50.00 a month, in the adjoining municipality the person in similar circumstances might only receive \$30.00, or a greater amount, so I say Mr. Chairman, surely to goodness we shouldn't suggest any support for the recommendation of the Honourable Member for

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... St. Boniface. I say frankly, and having had the experience of having to be in these situations, that this would be a sorry day for Manitoba. I don't think, I don't think yet, that many of our recipients of social allowances in the Province of Manitoba are receiving sufficient, but I do know that more, a greater number, are being taken care of in a more humane approach and humane respect than they would if we turned back to what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is suggesting to us. Not only, Mr. Chairman, is the question of turning back insofar as food, clothing and shelter is concerned, but if we went back to what he is advocating now we'd go back in the field of medical health. There would be no such things as what there is today: Medicare cards and -- I frankly argue that the Medicare cards are too restrictive entirely. I think it's criminal that the government is requiring people to deplete their assets down to \$250, cash assets of \$250, before they can qualify for a Medicare card. I think it's criminal that their total assets, including funeral allowances, can only be \$1,000, but Mr. Chairman, figure this with what it was before. If they owned a home before, under the system being advocated by my honourable friend a lien would be placed on the home for medical bills. Surely, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface couldn't really have meant what he said here tonight and I hope, even though I have some arguments from time to time with the Liberal Party of Manitoba, I hope that what my honourable friend advocates is not the policy of the Liberal Party, and if it is the policy of the Liberal Party I challenge them to state it so that we will know where we stand.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, before moving that the Committee rise, I would take the opportunity to remind honourable members of the meeting tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock in Room 254 of the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee.

I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, The Committee of Supply has considered a certain resolution, wishes me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for 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: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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