

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 9, 1964.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 passed.....

MR. SHOEMAKER:you called it 5:30, I was about to discuss some of the provisions in Bill 105, and I was going to suggest that the restrictions and limitations under those people who can gain admission to the Home seems to me in some cases to be pretty high. Let us assume for instance that the rental value of a suite or accommodation as outlined here would be set at \$60.00 a month -- and I understand that this is the case in certain places -- then five times that would be \$300.00, so that any person whose income including the Old Age Assistance or the Old Age Security is \$300.00 or less, then he could qualify to gain admission to these homes. Now, Mr. Chairman, you may say that that is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Chairman, so long as there's a priority. I hear disturbing rumours, and I hope that they are only rumours, that there are altogether too many fairly wealthy people occupying space in these Homes, and I think that certainly there should be provision for priority. I think that perhaps inasmuch as the government are giving grants to these Homes, that they should exercise some control over the admitting committee or whoever is responsible for admitting people to these various Homes. With the infirm people, well that is slightly different. I was wondering too, Mr. Chairman -- I know that this bill does not provide grants to individuals who want to build a Home, that the grants are limited to non-profit organizations and to municipalities, towns -- I was wondering if there might not be some merit in extending the grants to individuals because the private Homes that I know of personally in the province are pretty well run and run very economically, as my honourable friend knows. I think that in Neepawa for instance, where there is presently only one licensed for three or four persons, I believe the daily rate of care there is about \$4.00. I believe that the Home in Portage la Prairie, the Sunset Home, I believe they call it there, the per diem rate there is something like \$5.00 or \$6.00, and they are nursing homes, I think, in the true sense of the word; that is they are not elderly persons' housing, they are really nursing homes or homes for the infirm.

In the United States there are literally thousands, I suppose, according to an article I have here, of private licensed nursing homes. I wonder if my honourable friend has read a series of four articles appearing in the Consumers Magazine featuring nursing homes. About half of the magazine is taken up with nursing homes, the January, February, March and April issues of Consumer -- I believe they call it Consumer -- Consumer Reports, pardon me, Consumer Reports -- and it tells the public what to look for when they're out shopping for nursing homes because that is really what they do down there. I'd just like to quote one short paragraph here: "How To Shop For A Nursing Home. The best way to avoid these last minute crises is for Americans over 65 or so, especially those in good health who do not need nursing home care at the moment, to shop for themselves in advance of the need and to learn as much as possible of the local nursing home situation," and it goes on with about four or five pages to tell you what to look for in the way of accommodation, of course keeping in mind your needs and keeping in mind too your assets.

Well Mr. Chairman, just about every year, and I don't expect that this will be any exception, my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP and myself in particular raise this old matter of the difference between a means test and a needs test, and it is no wonder that we are at a loss to know the difference. There's a very good article here in the Tribune of March 14th, headed "Too Many Cooks Prepare the Welfare Broth," and it points up that there's a whole new concept. I suppose my honourable friend is responsible for this. The last paragraph says the government hopes to get the plan rolling by May; in the meantime it may spur agencies to devise some method to provide a designed plan of action in the whole welfare field but it points up that it is quite possible for a family to have half a dozen different social workers calling on them to assess their needs of one kind or another, and there's great confusion in this whole field.

There was an Order for Return that we received on February 14th of this year on the motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and he probably has it in front of him. I have our copy here. The question that was asked, the number of persons in receipt of medicare

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...benefits each month in 1963 where medicare was the sole social allowance benefit -- that was question No. 1. Question No. 2 -- the number of persons entitled to medicare benefits each month in the same period, and then the payments made by the province in 1963 to the Manitoba Medical Service under the medicare plan, and it is interesting to note that the answer given to question No. 2 -- that is, the number of persons entitled to medicare benefits each month in 1963 -- they increased almost every month right through to December. They started off in January at 19,820, ended up in December last with 22,640, and I suppose that there were that many medicare cards out at that time, and I suppose that the answer given to question No. 3, the payments made by the province to MMS under the medicare plan, the answer of \$305,078.40 represents the premiums that the province paid to MMS for the 22,640 card holders, or policy holders. I assume that that's what they mean, and that works about to about \$15.00 or a little less, if my calculations are correct, per medi-card holder per year.

Now if I'm not correct in my assumption I would like my honourable friend to answer that one for me because I have just quickly calculated that today. Now, I suppose that the needs test was applied here to determine this. I think it's a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the means test is still applied by the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons Allowances Board, and they, if you qualify for total disability pension, old age assistance, or blind persons pension you are automatically exempt from paying MHSP premiums. I think they call them Manitoba Hospital Commission Premiums. Now, these premiums amount to \$48.00 per person whereas the premiums here amount to \$15.00 per person, and I believe it is a fact that there are over twice as many people in this province exempt from paying premiums as receive medicare cards. I believe the Minister of Health told us on his estimates there was something like 54,000 Manitobans exempt from paying hospital premiums -- I believe that was it -- and according to the Order for Return we have here there was only 22,640 in receipt of medicare benefits. Well now, Mr. Chairman, why is it that these people who have received assistance by reason of the means test, why is it that they cannot qualify for medicare? They've qualified for premiums exemption but they don't qualify for medicare. Now my guess is, my guess is that if you were to put it to these people and say, now listen, you can have the premium exemption or you can have a medicare card, but you can't have both. Give me one if you like, but you can't have both; with 99 times out of 100 they'd take the medicare card. I would -- I would. Yet it only costs \$15.00 according to this, it only costs the government \$15.00 to give them a medicare card and it costs \$48.00 for hospital premiums. Now it is true that by giving them the medicare card it entitles them to other benefits like dental, drugs, and optical but when you add all, when you add the entire cost to this province for the medicare benefits that are provided by social allowance you have a figure of \$738,659.03, so that if you divide that figure by 22,640 it is still only about \$42.00 and some cents per person, or per recipient. Still less than the Manitoba Hospital premium for a family. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it would only be fair to offer these people who are presently on Old Age Assistance by reason of the fact that they got it by a means test, that they should by the same token receive Medicare benefits.

Mr. Chairman, we would have had, I suppose, a special session of the Legislature last fall if the Leaders of the Opposition had had their way over this whole issue of deducting the \$10.00 from a lot of these welfare recipients. There was a great lot of reporting done in the press two or three months ago on this whole issue -- November the 13th, "Pension Grab Angers the Aldermen," "Carroll Says the Policy is Misunderstood," "Province Won't Pass Along the Pension Hike," and I've got scads of them here, Mr. Chairman, and some pink sheets. I don't know whether I have any of those but certainly every member of this House is well aware of what transpired about three or four or five or six months ago when the Old Age Security Pension went to \$75.00 and then the Old Age Assistance remained at \$65.00 for a little while, then was eventually raised to \$75.00, and then the Social Allowances reduced by the same amount. Now, of course, my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare says the whole policy -- "Carroll says the whole policy is misunderstood." Everybody was out of step but him.

Now there was a special message -- certainly my honourable friend knows all about this because I guess it went out under his signature -- special message to recipients of Old Age Assistance, Blind Persons' Allowances and Disabled Persons' Pensions, went out with their October 1st cheque, went out with every one signed by J.B. Carroll, Minister of Welfare:

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)... "On October 1st, 1963, the Federal Old Age Security pensions for persons over 70 years of age were increased from \$65.00 to \$75.00 a month. The Old Age Assistance, Blind Persons' Allowance and Disabled Persons' Allowance have not changed. These latter three programs are shared by the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada. Manitoba is unable to grant increases in these programs until the Federal Parliament has passed appropriate amending legislation. Manitoba has indicated its support for this change. However, to date there has been no legislation introduced by the Federal Government. It is our hope that a satisfactory agreement may be reached with the Federal Government in the near future. In the meantime we felt that you should be aware of the reason for the delay in increasing your pension."

Now that went out to everybody that was in receipt of an Old Age Assistance cheque. Blind Persons' Allowance and Disabled Persons' Pension. What it says in effect, "We would just love to give you this money; we hope that we can get the Federal Government to act pretty quick; we haven't been able to get them to do anything yet, but" -- they're blaming it all on the Federal Government -- "and as soon as we can make a deal with the Federal Government, we'll be happy to pass this along to you." Well that was on October 1st. Then shortly after that they get another letter with the next cheque, more or less stating that they're sorry, you have been in receipt of Social Allowance, we're going to whack her down ten bucks -- or you don't need that ten bucks after all because we applied this needs test and you don't need it. The millionaire needs his Old Age Security cheque but you don't need your extra ten bucks.

Now here's a particular chap here who was getting \$11.55 Social Allowance during the summer -- \$11.55. Here's a letter that he got this year, January 24, 1964, and my guess is there were thousands that got letters similar to this. It said: "As you know, your Old Age Assistance Pension has been increased. The Social Allowance program was devised to supplement individual incomes. Therefore it is necessary at this time for us to review your Social Allowance budget. In view of your increased income you will now receive a cash allowance of \$2.00 from this department effective February 1, 1964. This will not affect your eligibility for Medicare. Should there by any change in regulation you will be advised immediately." So he came in and he said, "Well, I'm 45 cents up, 45 cents a month because I was getting \$11.55 so they've taken off ten and they're going to give me two. But," he said, "how is it I just didn't get a cheque for 45 cents?" And I said, "I don't know where they draw the line."

So I would like to ask my honourable friend -- I did intend to put in an Order for Return but I haven't done it -- I would like to know, is \$2.00 a month the smallest cheque that goes out? Si that the smallest one? Are there cheques for less than \$2.00 a month going out? Social Allowance cheques. I'd like to know the number that go out for exactly \$2.00, or less, and the number for, say, \$3.00 and less, and \$4.00 and less, because just to say to a fellow, "Well we have assessed your needs and in our estimation you're 45 cents short a month, so if we give you 45 cents that'll fix up you with the whole family." To me this just doesn't seem to add up, Mr. Chairman. I mean there must be some -- you draw the line somewhere. I know, I know the method by which they apply the needs test. They calculate his rent, and they calculate his living, and so on and so forth, and if this comes to \$74.95, then he doesn't get anything because his cheque is for \$75.00. But if it comes to \$75.25, do they pay him 25 cents and say, "Well here's two bits; everything's fine and dandy."

Here is a case here that is worse than the last one. Here is a letter -- this was dated last year but this chap got a letter on February 12th last year saying that "your application for Social Allowance has been rated 'eligible.' You have been enrolled for a cash allowance of \$8.00 per month effective March 1st." That -----1962, but it could apply today or it could apply any time. "Also you have been enrolled for Medicare. Early in March you will be in receipt of a Medicare certificate and the eight bucks." That was February 12th. On March 9th he got another letter, just 27 days later, saying, "We have been advised that your Old Age Assistance has been increased by \$10.00 effective February 1st, and our regulations stipulate that this increase must be taken into consideration in the amount of Social Allowance for which you are eligible." So he never got a cheque at all. -- (Interjection) -- He never got a cheque, because he was notified in February that his first cheque would come in March and then he got a letter on March 9th saying that his Old Age Pension had been increased by ten bucks and he wasn't going to get his eight bucks after all. -- (Interjection) -- Well they should

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...but they didn't give it to him.

So the point is, Mr. Chairman, that -- and as the Honourable the First Minister has said, perhaps this whole field should be based on need. Perhaps the Social Security Pension should be based on need. I'm one of those fellows, Mr. Chairman, that thinks that that wouldn't be such a bad idea, that the whole field -- that is I don't believe millionaires need an Old Age Security cheque. I don't believe they do need it -- but so long as they are going to be paid it, then why take the ten dollars away from the Social Allowance people. That's my point.

There are other cases, Mr. Chairman, that need some special concern. There are, as I will frankly admit, some people getting perhaps more than they need, some getting less than they need. When we were dealing with the estimates, the Health estimates, I told the House about my next door neighbour who had spent 400 days in the hospital at a cost to the province of \$8,000 and has since passed on, and during the entire 400 days that he was in the hospital -- Neepawa, and the Assiniboine Nursing Home -- his entire care was paid for by the Manitoba Hospital Plan; in addition he got \$75.00 Old Age Security cheque; in addition he got a Medicare card; and by reason of the fact that he was in the hospital for the 400 days he didn't need the Old Age Security cheque so his wife lived on it -- and there's nothing wrong with that. His wife is not in receipt of any pension of any kind, incidentally. But as soon as he passed away his \$75.00 Old Age Security Pension stopped, the Medicare card was taken away from her, she was told that she could not qualify for Social Allowance and she's too young to get Old Age Assistance and she is working -- shouldn't be working, in my estimation shouldn't be working. She isn't able to work, in my estimation, but she is. So there are cases of this kind where I believe special consideration should be given because they're cut right off.

I know other cases. I know of cases, Mr. Chairman, where a widow today, when her husband was living he was getting \$75.00 a month, 65 or 75 whatever the case may be, and in addition probably he was bedridden so she would be getting a Social Allowance to look after him, probably in total be getting \$100.00 or \$150.00 a month. Immediately upon his death the entire income is cut right off, Medicare card and all -- cut right off, so that the widow is in a very sad state of affairs. I know that under the -- unless the Social Allowances Act, unless there have been new sections declared under the Social Allowances Act, then these people do not qualify. I would like to ask my honourable friend in light of what he did say last evening as reported on page 1674 of Hansard: "The responsibility of government was clearly outlined. Section 3 of the Social Allowances Act says, and I quote: 'To take such measures as are necessary to ensure that no individual lacks the things, goods or services necessary to his health and well-being.'" I'm quoting my honourable friend. This is exactly what he said last night as recorded page 1674 of Hansard. Now in light of that statement there must have been new sections of the Act declared operative, because the Social Allowances Act as of this date does not guarantee that every citizen in the Province of Manitoba shall be taken care of. I think that there are certain exceptions quite a number of exceptions. In fact, my understanding was the Social Allowances Act provided social allowance for those persons who are presently in receipt of some kind of a pension.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of other matters that I would like to bring to my honourable friend's attention, and no doubt will as we proceed with the estimates. I would like to hear a little bit more about the Home Care and a little further explanation about this dynamic plan that is referred to in the Tribune of March 14th that he hopes to get rolling by May. I have received too, Mr. Chairman, a very disturbing letter from a friend of mine who used to live in Neepawa with regard to adoption. I have turned the whole file over to my honourable friend from St. Boniface, and he will deal with it because he is more familiar now with it than I am by reason of the fact that this chap is presently residing in the City, so I will await some answers from my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, for the honourable Minister not to give his answer Well if the NDP are finished, I'll proceed -- the members of the party. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring in the question of adoption. I think that I have mentioned something about this for the last two or three years and I can't see where there has been too much improvement. I would like the honourable Minister to tell me a little more this year than he did last year. He evaded the question or took it very lightly last year. I feel that it's not enough to have stories in the newspaper like we've seen a couple of weeks ago, "Motherless Babies in City Need a Temporary Home" and so on, and then when applications come in that there is a delay of up to

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...two years. Now I'd like the Honourable Minister to be able to deny this, deny that it takes over a year and at times two years and maybe more, before there's anything new on application for adoption. I think that this is very, very serious. We are told that there are many children who need homes and there are many people that would make wonderful parents, who would give anything to adopt a child, and they are discouraged because they have to wait so long. Now what is the reason for this? What is the reason? I think that this is very important and I definitely would like to have an answer this year on this. Now there is something else -- another question that we hear is that when they go in, they put in their application, at times the people are insulted or embarrassed by personal questions -- very personal, at times they feel embarrassing, questions. I want to say now that I can see the value, I can see the need for most of these questions but it is the way that these people are asking questions, and by whom. It is difficult to come in in a place where you have lived for quite awhile and you've seen a young girl grow up and she is now very qualified -- I want to make sure that I'm not running any of these people down, I think they are qualified in most instances -- but they are young people and they are asking you some pretty personal questions. Now is there really a value to all these questions? Do you think that somebody that wants to adopt some of these -- badly wants a child and if he doesn't qualify and he knows it, and he is not discouraged by the first interview, do you really think, Mr. Chairman, that that person will be honest when discussing his sex life with a 26-27 year old girl. I think that this is important. I know, I know that the people have to know this before you place a child. There are certain things you must know about that, but wouldn't it be advisable to have maybe a doctor to work with this? Probably one in Greater Winnipeg area would be enough, or an older person, an older social worker, an older person. I'm not saying that the young ones are not doing well, but let's think of the people -- it's embarrassing and I think that many of us will understand this is not the thing that we'd like to discuss with the first person we see.

Then there's the lack of continuity. You might wait six months before you get even a reply to your first application. You are called in and the first thing you know, this -- I don't know what the government can do. This is a difficult thing -- they can't stop this -- but the young girl, the young worker has left, she's married, she's no longer working and they have to start all over again, but this is something, something that happens fairly often. They start it -- I have cases of some people who have been at it since 1958. My honourable friend here has mentioned this case. Since 1958. They have a list of about four or five different people, they've had to start over practically every year. By some people they're told that they should go and see doctors, psychiatrists. Then they are told that they don't seem to be interested enough. Now I know there's always two sides to the story but there must be something when you hear so many complaints.

Some people are told -- this is a similar case that happened two or three times anyway this year, that people are asked well what would you like. "We would like to have a boy -- do we have a choice?" They were ready to take anything -- "Well we'd like to have a boy." Well that's fine; then they are called a few months after, "We have a girl for you." This happened -- I'll talk about this special case my honourable friend was mentioning. The lady was called, the would-be mother; she was told that they could have a girl. Well she was surprised. They had planned for a boy. They were told that they could have a choice, so she didn't say much -- she wanted to discuss this with her husband, which is the normal thing to do, which is the only thing to do, and she had to wait until he came in from work. Well later on, when they were over to see the person on this case, she was told that she wasn't interested enough. Her reaction at first -- she didn't go overboard because she didn't want to get that girl bad enough, so they didn't think she'd be a good mother. She had discussed this with her husband and her husband, after a little disappointment, felt well, let's take a girl. She wasn't asked then what she would do, she was told, "You weren't excited, you weren't interested enough, therefore we don't think you'd be good parents." I don't think there is anything wrong with somebody, especially when they are told you can have a boy or a girl. I think that this is one of the -- these people are mixed up.

Now I know there are always two sides to a story but there's an awful lot of complaints and I think the long delay is certainly the worst of all, the personal questions, the lack of continuity, and then another thing I think it's the lack of frankness. Now when I say this I think

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...that the workers and the people mean well. They are afraid to hurt somebody, but I think they make it worse and I think they should be made to realize this. They want to let you down easy so they tell you, well we haven't anything for you right now, but these people for some reason or other do not qualify, then they are left dangling.

I have another case here, they wanted a child so badly that they went over to another province to try to adopt a child. Of course, it had to be approved by the department here so there was not too much that they could do. Now it might look -- you won't satisfy everybody. There's another case, it may sound like crackpots. They've squawked against everybody, against everything, and I am sure that these people are doing their best. There are some cases that will never be satisfied, but I think that it's worth taking a chance and try to do this a little faster. After the interview with the parents, the father and the mother, then with the father alone, then with the mother, I think that then when they reach a decision, they should tell these people, not keep them dangling, afraid to hurt their feelings -- "Well we'll call you if we have anything," or "well, maybe not this year," and so on. I think that that's cruel. I think that these people should be told.

Now this varies. There are some districts where there are practically no complaints. They are doing very well. I understand that here, in the Greater Winnipeg area anyway, there's the Western and Eastern district, the Central district in Greater Winnipeg, right? But for some unknown reason people around Assiniboia are not included in this. They have to go directly to the Department of Welfare. They're not included in any district and this seems to be worse. Apparently they are better satisfied, the people of Manitoba are more satisfied through some agency of the Childrens Aid Society than when they have to go in the rural points -- well, for instance in Assiniboia here, they have to go directly to the Department of Welfare. So I think that it's not enough to have these stories, as I say, these stories about and pictures of very cute babies, and it breaks your heart to see these children. You receive the next day maybe 150 calls and so on, but it will take you two years, if you are lucky -- in two years you might be told you haven't got much of a chance. I hope -- this is not necessarily -- it's a complaint yes, it's certainly not an accusation. I think that this is a difficult thing and from what I understand there's an awful lot of good work being done.

And another thing I think, and probably this is the most important thing, that probably where the Department is falling down more than anything else, is on public relations. Tell the story to the people of Manitoba. Tell them why you have to find out these questions. Let them know. This is very easy and I'm sure that something like this you'd get very good press coverage. Tell the people of Manitoba why you do it, what you do, and how long it takes. Tell them that we're human beings and it takes a while, and let them know that if they feel that they're waiting too long and that they're getting the run-around they can go to the Department of Welfare and get this rectified. In other words, this government has the best public relationship program that I've ever seen. Well, probably in everything else but in this, in this welfare and this adoption. Let the people know what it's all about and I think you'd have much more co-operation.

I'm told that you're not getting good co-operation by the doctors. They will bring a medical and they are close to their patients, they are close to their friends, and sometimes they will coat it over with sugar to try to help these people to get their adoption, get their child. This I'm told by some of the people in the department. I have no way of proving this. I don't know if it's right or wrong but ask for better co-operation from the doctors also. They're human beings. The Honourable Member from Selkirk brought in a point today about these beatings. You read about these doctors -- some are afraid to report this. That's fine, but I think that in a case like this you should ask the good will and the co-operation of the doctors. But inform the general public, because right now they're mixed up on this adoption. If you need that many parents and if there are that many children that need a home, a father and a mother, well then I think it's worth the trouble, then really in all justice to the department for the work that's being done, let the people know, let the people know the steps they have to take, and if they're not satisfied what they should do. I think this would be in all justice to your department. I think this is something you should do. And there's certainly in all justice no more interested in these children and the would-be parents than your department, and I think it would help everyone.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...

Leaving this adoption field for awhile, I just want to say that I feel the same way in the construction of hospitals, that you have some of those in your department also, and I still think that you're on the wrong track when you are asking for the first 20 percent, the same as you are in the other hospitals, and I'm sure that you'll have to change this and I think that you should look into this right away. This is a matter for the Cabinet because this is a policy. The Honourable Minister of Health told me that there's no -- I don't know if it was he or the First Minister -- told me that there wouldn't be any raise in the premiums in the hospital field and he also told me that the policy of the government was still to ask, to insist that the first 20 percent should be paid by the hospital, would-be hospital, and I don't think that's possible now. It's possible if the municipality will pay for it, yes, but the people feel that they're paying their premiums and they feel it's up to the government. Rightly or wrongly so this is the way the people think. And it's practically impossible to get that first 20 percent from charitable donations. There's been a change because of this plan. There's nobody to blame for that but this is the case and the government will be blamed if they don't look into this soon and change this and get a different policy very soon.

Now there's been a question of welfare, of assistance and it's a very difficult one. It doesn't matter who's in power you'll always be criticized for some of these things and you can only do what you think is right and try to improve things as you go along. You have to make rules and then you have to break them because there's always some extra case, some difficult case. But I'm a little concerned with examples such as I've seen just a few days ago when this man stabbed his wife five or six times because she dared ask him for some of the money, some of the welfare money that they had received, that the man had cashed in the beer parlour. Now I'm not against these people having a drink but they should follow the same rules as every other family -- make sure there's milk for the children and there's food for the rest of the family before you start spending your money in the beer parlour. And every time we talk about having these people that are healthy, we talk about asking them to do some work, we're criticized -- this is against the dignity of man. Well, I don't believe in that. Probably I won't be very popular for saying this but I don't care because I think this is right. I'm interested in seeing more of this welfare help going to the children and the wife in the home when a man is healthy and he could work, and I don't think that a man that can cash his cheque in a beer parlour when there's nothing wrong with him can keep his dignity for very long. This is again a difficult case. I don't know exactly what could be done on this. Maybe the department is working on it. I'd like to know if there is any suggestion or any study being done in this. Are there stronger penalties for people that are not providing, because after all they are receiving this cheque not only for themselves, they have other human lives to worry about, and I think this is something that we should always try to improve. It will never be perfect but I think we should get it to improve and maybe if we would restore the dignity of some of these people. Probably they start at times they are just without work, but they lose this dignity because they haven't a chance to work, and I don't think it's such a bad idea to have some of these people do the work, that they be required to do some work before they get the cheque. If they're healthy there's nothing wrong with this at all. None of us -- I don't think that the world owes us a living. In a rich country like ours definitely we have a responsibility for the handicapped and those who can't help themselves. Surely to God we don't have to take care of parasites.

Then there's another, there's another question that I think is important. We've been trying hard on this; there's been an awful lot of improvement. It's the question of the way we've treated the Indians and the Metis. I think that for too long we've been guided by what we would like the Indians and the Metis to be like. We wanted to bring them to our own civilization and we're not looking at the problem through their eyes, and I think this might be one of the reasons why we're having a little trouble. The Honourable Minister yesterday talked about these people that were pioneering -- they were leaving the Reserve and they were coming here; they had an awful lot of courage. But I'm not sure if we're not asking them a little too much, trying to take them away. They are human beings also; they need their security; they are taken away often from their families and they are just thrown in this jungle, because it is a jungle to them. And what do we hear about Indians? "They're shifty people; they steal; they can't hold a job; they are not trustworthy." This is the reaction that we have, because oftentimes we feel that this is

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)...the experience that we've had with these people. So we put them all in the same bag and this is it. Who wants to hire a Metis, an Indian? "You can't leave anything laying around with these people. They'll rob you blind. Now if they come in, one day they'll be there at 9:00 o'clock, the next day at 10:00 o'clock, then they don't come in for a week." Well, are we fair in judging people like this? These people have -- sometimes I think that they are more civilized than we are -- they have their own civilization. They're people that also want their self-respect, they're proud people, but they're people that are used to -- they're very open. There's nothing that belongs to them there. They don't just lock anything up. If somebody needs help they'll give it to them, and they feel it's the same thing. If they need help they'll just take it; they're borrowing it. And I would advocate that we start thinking a little more through the Indian's eye before we judge him. I think that it might be a good idea, instead of throwing him in this jungle, try to bring work to the Reserve, piece work. Those people are proud and they're human beings and they want security also, and they get security in their own Reserve. To some of us these things might be shacks and tents, and we have some of these wild stories, pictures of these shacks, and "this is awful that human beings live in them." You try to change these people, put them in a place with wall-to-wall carpet and good furniture and picture windows like was done in Churchill with the Eskimos, and the first day the picture window is broken, the furniture is all smashed and they are on the floor. You see we can't always judge people by our standards. It took us quite a while, this civilization that we're talking about, it took us quite awhile to graduate from the shack of our grandfathers, great-grandfathers and so on, to the modern homes that we have now. But we expect the Indian to graduate from his tent to these kind of homes now and if he doesn't like it we think there's something wrong. I think that there's too much of this quarrelling and moaning about this of being unfair with these people, that they're living in shacks and so on. Some of this is of their own choosing. I think that this is not where we can help them so much but I think we should bring work to their Reserve. Is there any reason why we can't do that, Mr. Minister? I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister what he thinks about this. Isn't there a lot of work that we can bring near the Reserve where these people can stay there, where they can better themselves, where they can take pride? Yes, at first it's true. They'll miss a day; they'll miss a couple of days; but they'll be paid by piece work and they'll work that much harder, and they'll earn their living and we won't be -- the biggest revenue for the Indian-Metis population of Manitoba will not be the welfare cheque. I think that in all, in dealing with human beings there's no use trying to make a big thing of -- we should see these people living in the same homes as everybody else and so on. This is not what they want right now. This will take a while. I think it's more important than trying to judge people, to try to look at the whole problem the way they do and understand them. And then we might instead of saying, "Well the Indian is shifty," we'll realize that the Indian is clever with his hands; we'll realize that the Indian could give anything. There's nothing that the Indian will not do for his brother or his friend. I think that we would get to learn a little more from them, and maybe they would teach us an awful lot also. I would suggest that we at least, that the Department of Welfare at least look into this. Not to just try to get them in the city and then give them their welfare cheque. And at times they need a little help, and this is cut and dried. They either qualify or they don't. At times we should, maybe even if they're working we should help them a little and give them a chance to get on their feet. All right, break those strict rules which the department have. I think we should do this once in a while, and if we were a little more patient with some of these people, I think that we would realize they were just as good in their own way. They certainly have an awful lot more than we have in certain ways, even though they don't measure to our standard of civilization, and I think that this is something that the department should look into. We've tried co-ops with these people, well we've seen that this does not work. They're not that kind of people I think that care to -- (Interjection) -- What was that? We haven't tried -- well I don't know if we haven't tried hard enough. I think maybe we should call them in and see what they think of these co-ops. I don't think they want too many of these things. I think what they want is: they want to work, they want to stay-- their home is just as important as ours. They would like to stay on the reserve. Let's better this reserve instead of bringing them into this jungle and I think that we probably would be much more successful because I think that unfortunately the Indian has a reputation that he doesn't deserve.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I really feel that possibly I should say a word at this particular time because I think I'm extremely disappointed with the remarks that have just been made by the Member for St. Boniface, because I really fail to understand how a man could sit in this House for the number of years that he has, and know so very little about what we're trying to do in the field of community development. He absolutely has no understanding of the role of community development and what we're trying to do to help the Indian to help himself. We're not establishing any goals for the Indian. I think one might well say that the Federal Government through the Department of Indian Affairs had for many many years tried just that, and it was an utter and complete failure, an utter and complete failure. They kept the Indians on the reserves. They told the Indian what to do; they set the goals for the Indians. They destroyed his initiative to the point where it's little wonder that we're faced with the problem that we're facing today. But I'm happy to say there's been a great change in the thinking of Indian Affairs in recent years, and I think they're beginning to understand the philosophy of community development. And I would certainly hope that our Member for St. Boniface would understand too, because it isn't our idea to bring the Indians into Winnipeg; to make them like us. We're trying to help them accomplish their goal that they set for themselves. The Indians that went on strike at Thompson, what did they want. Did they want to stay on the reserve at Nelson House? No, they wanted jobs where they'd had jobs in recent years. They'd helped to build that big plant at Thompson and then were denied opportunities to work in it for one reason or another. They wanted employment. They wanted employment. And this is what the fuss was all about. They weren't striking because they were starving, because they weren't starving. They wanted employment. They wanted to come out. They wanted the better things of life. They wanted to be more like the white man and enjoy some of the privileges that he had. And really this is the purpose of our program. We don't judge by our standards. This is the first time in Canada that anyone has gone into an Indian reserve and respected his customs; respected his culture; respected the differences between the Indian and the white man and not tried to mold him in our image, because they have things in their culture that we should envy because they have a great many things that could benefit our white civilization. We accept the Indian and the goals that are being established by them. We're helping them to carry out, and this is the philosophy of community development, and this is the way it differs from any other program that's taken place in recent years among those people.

And with respect to taking employment to them, sure I expect that in some cases it may be possible to develop economic employment; economic opportunities nearer in, or nearer Indian reserves, and where that's possible, we're helping them to do that. But I think it's uneconomic to try to establish areas where the geography and everything else is against it. I think this is bound to failure and bound to result in disaster. We started a handicraft program, and I believe we've discussed it in the House here last year, and we're having tremendous success with that program in its initial stages in trying to encourage home industry of that kind, but we're finding that more and more the Indians themselves are wanting to move out of their Indian reserves to get employment side by side with their white brothers.

And where the co-ops are being developed -- we're not trying to force the co-ops down their throats. Now this has happened in some cases. It happened at Norway House with respect to a consumer co-op, and that co-op failed. It happened in one other reserve that I know of where the -- and this co-op that was established up there wasn't established by community development. It was established by a well-meaning white individual in that community. But it didn't have the support of the local people. They didn't understand, they didn't want it. Someone said we think you should have a co-op. They established the co-op and it failed because it wasn't their co-op. It wasn't their idea. The same thing may happen at this other one that I'm referring to. It was established by one of the white missionaries that went in there. He said, "I think it's a good thing for you people to have a co-op." He set it up and six months later he was over doing his business with the white trader and left that thing to flounder by itself -- now it may succeed -- but where we're establishing co-ops, it's where the people themselves come forward and say we see opportunities here for us to get greater advantage from the resources at hand, and there have been some tremendous success stories. Absolutely phenomenal stories for people who for many many years had tried to live off the resources unsuccessfully, were supported by federal and provincial welfare payments, and substantial ones, who as

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)...a result of their own initiative, developed pulpwood co-ops, or fishing co-ops where there were tremendous economic successes; where they came off the welfare roll; where they restored their pride, and where their initiative was restored, and these people are doing things now for the first time, and they're proud of these accomplishments, and we're proud that we have been able to help them to accomplish these things.

And these are the things that we're doing in community developments. We're not trying to shove these things down their throats. And I thought maybe I should rise at this time because I feel so strongly about the misinterpretation, or the misunderstanding that the Member for St. Boniface has with respect to the Indian and Metis.

Now with respect to the question of spending welfare money in beer parlors. Certainly the Department of Welfare doesn't condone the squandering of welfare payments. I rather suspect that this was an able bodied man. We don't pay welfare to many able bodied men. We do provide welfare to the unemployed in unorganized territories, the local government districts, but I rather suspect that the man that the Member for St. Boniface is talking about is probably on the City Welfare rolls, the city of St. Boniface, because -- (Interjection) -- he's not. Was he drawing provincial welfare?

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't know.

MR. CARROLL: You're sure he was drawing welfare?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I was The Honourable Minister probably read the same story, or he could have. It was in the paper a while ago and I can assure you he wasn't from St. Boniface. -- (Interjection) -- He might have been from The Pas, I don't know.

MR. CARROLL: And he was drawing Unemployment Insurance. He should be talking to -- what's his name down in Ottawa, Minister of -- Mr. McEachern, probably he could solve this problem. This man was drawing unemployment insurance, not welfare payments, but at the same time

MR. DESJARDINS: It's your story.

MR. CARROLL: It's the principle, and I would agree with your thinking on this. I think it's wrong for people drawing welfare to be squandering that money and not paying it for the purposes for which it was given. And I've had these same sort of complaints.....

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, did he say he didn't agree with me?

MR. CARROLL: No, I do agree.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh.

MR. CARROLL: I do agree. No, no, we're on the same side on this. We disagree with respect to Indian and Metis, but I'm all on your side with respect to the abuse of welfare payments. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, buddies under the skin with respect to this, because I think I've been as critical of the Welfare Department as anyone for people who get money, welfare money and abuse it, and frankly I would certainly be very happy if any members of this House, or members of the public could tell me of the suspected cases of abuse, because I'm sure that we would be happy to investigate those things. And if it's true, if it's true we have a technique for handling it because we do administer welfare funds where there are cases of abuse of this kind. Because the one thing we don't want is for people to go out and spend welfare money that's designed to support women and children and the family and keep them together.

Now getting back to this question of adoptions that the member raised. I think again we're on common ground here, because it is true that we have a problem in certain sections of Manitoba with respect to adoption and adoption applications. There are two areas in the province in which at the present time we are behind in adoption applications. One of them happens to be in the Central Interlake District which includes-- and this is part of the great urbanization process-- it happens to include the Municipalities of Assiniboia and Charleswood, and because of the tremendous influx of young couples into that area, wanting to adopt people, the program has got rather substantially behind in that particular area. The other area in which we happen to be a bit behind at the present time is in Northern Manitoba, resulting from the movement of people and particularly in the Thompson area. And we are doing our best. We have increased the staff to some extent and we do have in these estimates, and one of the few increases we have with respect to welfare workers is to tackle this problem of child welfare. And in addition to increased permanent staff we have a special "Shot-in-the-Arm Program" it's called, to

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)...try this summer to get rid of this backlog of applications for adoptions, and the program will be to take students who have their degree, who have had one year of social work, take a group of them -- and I think the number is six -- who are working with us during the summer vacation. We will attach to them a senior social worker to tackle this problem to see if we can't reduce the backlog of applications so that we can come up-to-date so there will be fewer people waiting the long periods of time that the Member for St. Boniface is talking about.

I'd like to say one other thing though. Our adoption plan isn't set up as a convenience to those who want children. Our adoption program is set up to try and get the best homes that we can for the young people that we have to place in the province. And you'll recognize too, that most of the adoptions in Manitoba are placed through the voluntary agencies, the various Children's Aid Societies of Manitoba. In those areas where there is no Children's Aid Society then it is handled through the Department of Welfare.

With respect to embarrassing questions. I would like to say that I've had an opportunity to investigate this sort of thing and I find that the questions are, generally speaking, of a very routine sort of a nature, but where we suspect, or where one of the partners indicates some abnormal marital relationship, then we delve much more deeply into the questions, and ask many more questions than we would normally do. And I think one would say that this is normal prudence. After all, the placing of a child in a family is a very personal thing because you're affecting the very life of that child, and I think that if any one of us here had to give up our child to another home we would want to have a pretty long close look at the family before we gave up that child, and this is in effect the responsibility that is placed on the Children's Aid Society, to try and get the best possible home for that particular young person. And I think that there is the closest possible scrutiny to make sure that the family is a proper family for the particular child that is being placed, and the fact that this takes a long time means generally speaking that they're doing a very thorough investigation and we can really not fault them for this, although it must be a terrible agony for those who are hoping to get a child in their home quickly and find that they must wait for a substantial period of time.

But there is one other thing that I'd like to mention. There are many people who apply for adoption to -- they say that "we want a fair-haired blue-eyed boy" between a certain age, certain sex, and they place the kind of restrictions themselves on the kind of child they want to go into their home, and when this happens it may take some time for that kind of a child to come under the Children's Aid Society, and this is sometimes quite an impediment to people getting children quickly. But I will say this, that these people are working conscientiously and sincerely trying to make the best placements they can, and we must apologize for any delays which may have taken place. We are beefing up our welfare appropriation to try to strengthen our placement work in the province, and I must confess that we've had substantial success during the last few months in placements, greater success than we had last year, and we hope that we'll have substantially more in the future.

But there is one other problem I'd like to mention briefly. There are some Children's Aid Societies where they have a lot of children but very few adoption homes, and the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg happens to be one of them. They get an awful lot of children in this particular society and fewer foster homes, or permanent adoption homes, and one of the techniques that's being used is a central adoption registry which is helping substantially in placing these children elsewhere in the province. It's sort of a clearing house for children that may be difficult to place within any particular agency. Each week the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg bulletin those children that will be available for adoption the following week, and this goes out to all of the other societies and to the Director of Welfare here in Manitoba, so that we have a way of knowing more quickly the kind of children that are up for placement, and if we have the homes properly canvassed we hope to be able to place much more quickly than ever before.

We also have under discussion just at the present time -- and it's been fairly recently that this has come forward -- some discussion with respect to the boundaries of our Children's Aid Societies to see whether there can't be some advantage in rearranging these boundaries somewhat to have a more efficient utilization of personnel and homes and children for adoption.

I'd like to move now to the Member for Inkster. He always is very sincere in the words

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd)...that he says to the House and I'm really not quite sure where he's placed me. He -- I'm between the devil and the deep blue sea -- I guess that's where it is about. But I do agree with him that more work has to be placed, more emphasis on the rehabilitation of people who have for one reason or another got into trouble, and this is the aim of the department and we'll continue to work out to try and help these people, to help to solve problems rather than just transmit money to people in need.

Now the Member for Gladstone raised some questions. It is true that a person, or a couple -- we have no individual suites where the rent's as high as \$60.00 a month. The highest I believe is \$45.00. But where there is a couple in a double unit where the rental is \$60.00 a month, it is true that they can earn up to \$300.00 a month and still find accommodation within that particular housing unit. But where the real work is done is with the Admissions Committee, because they are charged -- and this is made up of local people. Usually the sponsoring organization reaches out beyond their own group to take in the medical doctor or the welfare worker, if one's available, and they try to place people in these various homes on the basis of need, and we think this is the proper criteria to use, to put the people in these homes whose need is the greatest. I think on investigation you'll find that there aren't very many people who are earning even up to three or four times the amount of the rental. We made some enquiries here in Winnipeg and the people have told us that they don't believe that there is anybody within their unit who would be getting from one source or another as much as \$200.00 a month. So there really are very few people in the higher income brackets that can really take advantage of the fine facilities that are being placed throughout the province.

I really don't believe that we can justify the expenditure of public funds for the support of proprietary nursing homes. I think this is an investment that the individual estimates on his own. We don't support any other business enterprise to my knowledge by way of public grants. We do support them by way of loans from time to time through the Manitoba Development Fund but that's only on a business basis, and so on. So I think really there's very little hope that we will be in the business of trying to subsidize people in the profit nursing homes in the Province of Manitoba.

The cost of Medicare cards is at the present time \$5.11 per person per month, whereas the cost of hospitalization, as my honourable friend should know, is \$2.00 per person per month, -- (Interjection) -- \$5.11, \$5.11 -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Yes, yes, that includes the whole works. -- (Interjection) -- Drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, plus Medicare, plus full medical coverage. Some confusion?

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's some confusion because the MMS does not cover optical. Is this just an average outcost or how is this \$5.11

MR. CARROLL: They're administering this for us. They're administering the whole

MR. SHOEMAKER: The return that we have here.....

MR. CARROLL: Well, we just gave you the medical cost. You asked for the medical cost. This includes your dental costs, eyeglasses, dentures, drug costs -- which are higher, drug costs are higher than your medical costs -- (Interjections) -- They're all given here.

MR. PAULLEY: No I don't believe so -- are they?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well the four -- this is the way they're itemized. The cost to the province of the premiums paid for the Medicare cards, that is \$305,078.40, dental \$146,425.86, Drugs \$521,391.26, optical \$70,841.91. Now I don't think that that would come to -- what did you say, \$5.11?

MR. CARROLL: Five dollars and eleven cents. There has been a negotiation with respect to the doctors which now includes in addition to the house and office calls, it does now include calls in hospitals, in hospital calls as well as the others, which did result in a slightly higher increase. I'll have another look at those figures and maybe I can give you some more information on it later.

MR. PAULLEY:Mr. Chairman, before we leave this, so this is clearly in my mind. Am I given to understand from the Minister that for a contribution, or a premium to MMS of \$5.11, that MMS take care of dental, optical, drug and medical care insofar as recipients of welfare are concerned? -- (Interjection) -- Well let me ask that question first because depending on what the answer is I may have a comment further.

MR. JOHNSON:if I may, the agreement is this, that separate agreements were

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)...made with the various societies, the dental profession, the medical profession, the optometrists and the Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association with respect of those people who are the direct responsibilities of the province, and Medicare as we know it under the Social Allowances program includes all these services. As a matter of administrative convenience, the medical card issued to the recipient of Medicare has on the back of it -- the same number is used when the patient takes that card and shows it to the druggist, or the dentist or the optician. They use that number and send it into the Department. This was a courtesy extended to us by the Manitoba Medical Service in using that card in this way.

MR. PAULLEY: Well then again, Mr. Chairman, to get back -- I don't know, I may not have heard the Minister all the way through, due to some conversations that were taking place to my right, I may have missed one or two of his remarks. But am I given again to understand that the net cost to the province per individual for dental, optical, drug and medical care is \$5.11. Now this is my question.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, that's right -- that's correct.

MR. PAULLEY: This is correct then, Mr. Chairman, that the net cost for dental, optical, drug and medical care per individual in the province of Manitoba amounts to \$5.11 in cost.

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Chairman, may I ask, what is the opposition to a comprehensive medical care scheme for the Province of Manitoba when such services are rendered so cheaply.

MR. CARROLL: I think if I may comment that we are getting what we consider to be a very good deal from these people, because this is part of their contribution to those in need.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the First Minister says we don't pay the full cost, has he, as Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Welfare, or the Minister of Health, any indication of what the actual cost is or would be for the same services that are being rendered?

MR. CARROLL: I was just wondering now, possibly we shouldn't be diverted by this technical point here at this date.

MR. PAULLEY: It's not technical, Mr. Chairman, I'm seeking information

MR. CARROLL: I'm still making my reply to the first question. I'd be very happy for you to ask that question later. I'm not sure that this would be the right department to talk about it. It may be. It may be, but what. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: It is and I want to

MR. CARROLL: dealing with one or two other points.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, let's get these figures straight before we carry on. Let's get this straightened out. The question to No. 2 as given in this Order for Return, the question No. 2 asked, the question asked, the number of persons that are entitled to Medicare benefits each month in 1963 -- (Interjection) -- I said in January of 1963 -- you show the figures as 19,820. In December as 22,640. So let's just say for the sake of an argument there was an average of 22,000 per month for 1963. Now, how did you get the answer to the question of the number of persons entitled to Medicare when for instance a Medicare card goes out, and there is three people in one family use it, four in another family that are using it, five in another family that are using it. Right?

MR. CARROLL: That's quite possible that that is so.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then when you give the answers -- well my first question would be: are there 22,640 Medicare cards out as of now? Are there that many cards, or that many persons receiving benefits from the cards?

MR. CARROLL: What does that Order for Return say that you have in your hand?

MR. SHOEMAKER: It says the number of persons entitled to Medicare benefits.

MR. CARROLL: Those are the number of people who are covered by Medicare. Now there may not be that many Medicare cards, but those are the number of people that are covered by Medicare in the province today.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So it does not necessarily mean then that there are that many cards out.

MR. CARROLL: That's quite right -- quite right.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon? Well I would like the answer to this. How many cards are

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...there out? I mean then we can talk

MR. CARROLL: I think at the time the Order for Return was requested, I think we told you that we could give you the information on the basis of the number of people that were covered, rather than the number of cards. I don't know where my honourable friend was that day, but this was the way the Order for Return was accepted and I think you will find that it may not completely add up because there has been a negotiation with the Manitoba Medical Association and MMS with respect to extended coverage of Medicare for the period beyond, the period that was covered by this particular return which has resulted in a slightly increased cost for Medical Service.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then what is the basis for paying the premium to MMS? What is the basis for the government paying premiums to the MMS? Is it per card?

MR. CARROLL: We are paying on the basis per person. We are paying it so much per person and not so much per card. The card in itself means nothing. Now as I understand it we are paying so much per person, but I'll clarify that. I'll get that question answered but that's my understanding of it.

I think the Member for Gladstone and I agree on at least one thing this evening. He says perhaps that all old age assistance, blind, disabled, perhaps all of these things should be on the basis of means. If he agrees with that statement I think we are on common ground here.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Old age security, social allowance. I think perhaps.....

MR. CARROLL: You haven't been convinced yet. This is the philosophy of this government. We have advocated to your friends down there in Ottawa, and if you have any influence down there I wish you would pass that along to them, because we think this is the real way to meet need, to pay on the basis of need, rather than this means test versus needs test arrangement, whereby people who are getting, in some cases, old age assistance; people are getting in some cases, disability allowances possibly who do not actually need that on the basis of the standards that we have established. So if we agree on that particular philosophy then maybe there is some hope for progress down in Ottawa when we meet once again to discuss welfare problems.

I think maybe, Mr. Chairman, that's about all that was asked of any real substance and I'm quite prepared to have any further questions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there's any real substance in this or not, but whether there is, or whether there isn't, the Minister is certainly going to hear of it, and whether there is any substantive answers coming from the Minister or not, remains to be seen.

He suggested to me a moment ago when I was trying to find out more particulars insofar as the monthly cost of \$5.11 was concerned, that I was more or less interfering with his trend of thought, or his rebuttal to the Member for Gladstone, but I now want to pursue this a little further. The Minister said to us that the cost per individual on welfare for complete Medicare, with the exception of hospitalization, was \$5.11 per person per month. This included medical care, dental care, optical care, and the cost of drugs. Now I want to hear from my honourable friend -- I asked him whether this was handled through MMS and, if I recall correctly, the answer was no, that there were arrangements with other branches of the healing arts, including the druggists, that took care of all of this.

My honourable friend, the Member for Selkirk suggested that possibly the reason for the premium being \$5.11, if I understood him correctly, was the price that is being paid, or the Medical Society are prepared to pay in order that we do not have a comprehensive medical scheme here in the Province of Manitoba. And I suspect greatly, Mr. Chairman, that the remarks of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk are not too far out of line when -- if he didn't suggest, I will suggest because I certainly don't want to put words in my honourable friend's mouth -- I certainly will suggest that this is a partial answer by the Manitoba Medical Service Association to comprehensive Medicare in the Province of Manitoba. But anyway, notwithstanding this, I do want to know from the Minister of Welfare how this figure of \$5.11 per person per month is arrived at, which is covering all of these various costs to the recipients of Medicare in the Province of Manitoba.

My honourable friend may not have this information, but maybe I'd better, Mr. Chairman, let him answer for himself, as to whether or not he has this information because I am very much interested in this, because if the cost for complete comprehensive Medicare

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...coverage for the recipients of welfare in the province of Manitoba is only \$5.11 and this is all inclusive, then while I appreciate the fact that the Medical profession, and the other professions as well, may be making some contribution to the provision for service, at the low cost or at cost -- and I would suggest that it would be at cost rather than be low cost -- while they are making apparently, or can be making possibly a contribution, this should be an indicator of what the cost of an overall comprehensive scheme for every resident of Manitoba should be. I would appreciate Mr. Chairman hearing from the Minister as to a breakdown of this \$5.11.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I really don't have that information just at hand at the moment but I will attempt to get it for him possibly later tonight. However, it is made up by the negotiated rate with MMS for the coverage which we have with that organization. It works out on a 50 percent proration as their actual cost of services. In other words we get 50 percent of the normal rate that would be charged for the various kinds of service that are being given, plus the cost, the actual cost of the drugs, dental work and so on with a substantial contribution from the professions involved. They are taking substantially less than they would normally take in providing service and this is the actual cost of all that service, divided by the number of people and so on. It comes out \$5.11 per person per month. If you want to calculate that on the basis of total population in Manitoba, you'd find it works out to something in excess of \$60 million a year, and it could be substantially above that. Well it works out to \$60 per person, a little over, and we've got a million people in the Province of Manitoba, and I'm not sure that on a comprehensive plan we would be prepared to get quite as good a deal from the medical profession and others as we're getting here, because to some extent I suspect that those who are paying the regular rates are helping to subsidize this kind of an arrangement. Now I'm not sure of that but I suspect that that is right. So that if we're going to pay the full cost we may be talking more in terms of \$80 or \$100 million a year. I'm not sure what it's costing people now privately. It may be more than that, it may be substantially less, but these are the kind of figures we're talking about which added to the \$50 million that you're asking for for pensions would amount to a pretty substantial increase in costs if we were to implement all of these things, desirable as they may be. They do add up to some pretty healthy figures and some pretty healthy taxes.

MR. PAULLEY:just for a moment, let's not worry about adding up costs of pensions and this, that and the other. Let's not befuddle the question under discussion at the present time and this was the line that my honourable friend took a moment ago and I want to remind him of his own words.

I appreciate very much that the Minister has said that the MMS, or rather the Manitoba Medical Society apparently are taking 50 percent of their stated charges as being applicable.

MR. CARROLL: I said about 50 percent.

MR. PAULLEY: About 50 percent yes -- and I believe this to be so. Of course 50 percent of the fees are set by the Medical Society themselves as to what their desire is.

And then the Minister went on to say that insofar as dental services and optical and drugs they are more or less on an arrangement and he says that they take substantial reductions from what they would normally charge. I might interject that in many cases what they normally charge is pretty exorbitant, particularly in the drug and optical field and dental -- I guess I might as well include all three of them -- pretty onerous when you're on the paying end of it. But I would like to hear from the Minister, and he said he hoped that the ivory tower by inference would be able to send him down a message before tonight was over as to what these substantial reductions actually amount to. They are most interesting. And I agree with my honourable friend that if even on the basis of the \$5.11 a month, or to use the figure roughly \$60 a year, with a million population, if we put even this into force in the Province of Manitoba it would amount to a bill of \$60 million. It sounds an awful lot of money and I'm sure that this was the reason that my honourable friend the Minister used this this evening because it does sound like a heck of a lot of money, about 50 percent of our budget. But notwithstanding the use of the figures by my honourable friend I suggest that the total population of the Province of Manitoba in respect of these cares are paying far in excess of \$200 million at the present time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I know that on this medicare program that the medical profession has agreed to accept a lower rated fee for the work being done and I question

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)...very much the propriety of the government in negotiating, or bargaining with the medical profession to convince it to accept a lesser fee, Mr. Chairman. The medical profession as it is today takes a percentage of what it considers a fair fee for the service which it offers. I've heard figures of 85 percent, and 75 percent, and I know they vary but I know that the medical profession has always taken, or as far as I know they have taken less than 100 percent of what they feel is a proper rate in their MMS payments and from their standpoint it is a good method of handling it because they don't carry accounts receivable on their books; they don't have to write off bad debts. They know that all persons on MMS are paying them and in order to receive this it is a good financial transaction for the doctor. But I do not see that the doctor ought to be in a position of receiving a lesser payment because he is attending to a person who is on Medicare. Now the Honourable Minister suggested that possibly to some extent the cost was being subsidized by those who are on the regular MMS and if that were true then I'd say that was a wrong thing to do. So -- he's shaking his head -- so I assume that I did not interpret him correctly.

So then I'll get back to the suggestion that we have agreed to, and that is that the medical profession is taking a lower rate of payment for the same service which the medical profession is giving to me or to any other member of the community who is on MMS, or possibly on private care than a person who is on Medicare. I say that that is wrong because the quality of the service no doubt is the same. The quantity of the service I trust is the same and that being the case why should the medical profession be required to make any special concessions to the people who are on Medicare. To the extent that the medical profession has always given of itself, and not spared itself of the efforts to provide medical services to the people of the province, as the contribution that they have made must be recognized, but I don't think that one doctor ought to be put in a different position than another because that one doctor may be handling more patients, or a larger percentage of his patients, from the medicare group than from those who are not. Maybe the geographic location of the doctor determines for him the nature of the patients that he handles, that is, the economic ability of the patients that he handles. This to me is unfair and also puts the scheme in danger in that there may be some doctors who may find that it pays them to give a different type of service to the people who don't pay as well as to that patient for whom the doctor receives a higher rate of pay. So that I question very much whether it is proper to have negotiated on this basis to what appears to me to be the disadvantage of the medical practitioners.

Now the problem of the \$60 million is one which is not really a problem except to those who are afraid of large figures. The Minister was no doubt correct when he made a quick calculation, it came to \$60 million and he said it might be \$80 million. My Leader indicated it's probably a good deal more and to the extent that the medical profession has already showed that it is prepared to take on a package deal where they get paid on a fee for service basis than one which is paid through a comprehensive scheme, then I don't think that the figures ought to frighten anybody, least of all members of a party which has proven that they are capable of throwing these size figures around and coming up with the answers which they think are correct. So that I would suggest that the Minister ought not to fear the figures which he has produced to us and ought to recognize the fact that he has been obtaining a service which is a negotiated one -- I presume there was no compulsion on the medical profession to accept this reduced rate. Surely the government would not have compelled the medical profession to do anything that would have any element of having to accept conditions laid down for them but has been able to negotiate a deal which has been this much of an advantage to the government. The way the Honourable Minister is looking skyward makes me feel that he is not yet ready to deal with this so that I am prepared to deal with another aspect of what he has already spoken about to give him a little more time. If he wants to signal to me that he's now ready to deal with this I'll sit down and rise again when he is through with this matter.

MR. CARROLL: Well to begin with, I think really you didn't mean to reflect on the integrity of the medical profession in suggesting that they might have a double standard, a standard for the rich and one for the poor. I'm quite sure the honourable member didn't although it did sound a little bit like that in the suggestion that they might somehow or other cheapen their service because they weren't getting full fee for it. I'm quite sure that the member himself might not charge the widow with little income the same amount that he might charge some of the honourable members of this House who may be in a position to better afford his kind of service. I think that he would, in the same way, would give the same high quality of service as I'm sure a medical man would who might be working with medicare patients.

I would like to say that we've had exceptionally fine co-operation from the doctors of Manitoba with respect to the implementation of this scheme. They have been wholehearted in their support of it; they've come along willingly and I think we would say that we could not have hoped to succeed, as we have done I believe with this program, without this kind of co-operation from the doctors, indeed from the dentists and from the druggists and from the others who are involved in this program.

Now with respect to the M. M. S. and medicare, they do have a separate account for the medicare programs so that there's no dipping into the other medicare account to subsidize this. This is something which they themselves give as part of their public service. I do have word from on high -- in the estimates for 64-65, the M. M. S. is calculated at \$2.61 a month; drugs, \$1.40; dental, 80 cents; optometry, 30 cents; for a total of \$5.11.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder that the Honourable Minister found it necessary to involve himself in my personal economic life and my motivations in dealing with people to whom I offer services. I'm sure he didn't intend to do it, just as I'm sure he didn't intend to impute suggestions of words that I might have used, had I used the words that he would have liked me to use, to embarrass myself into having apparently said something that wouldn't stand up to the cold rearrangement of words in which he wanted to put them.

It is not a question of using words such as cheapening a service but rather the question of providing a service, and I think that it is perfectly true that the medical profession is one of the busy professions and one of those professions which give of themselves to such an extent that they must necessarily cut down, or in some way restrict the amount of service that they are able to give, each individually, and I'm sorry that just by trying to twist the words which I had used the Minister almost suggested to me that the doctors are of such a calibre that they would, all of them, that not one of them would fall heir to this problem of having to pick and choose as between the services he offers the patient. I'm sorry really that the government is so proud of its negotiated bargain with doctors that it is prepared to put the doctors in the position where they are compelled to differentiate in their minds between the returns which they receive for the same service which they offer to different people.

I'm pleased that the Honourable First Minister found it necessary to suggest that the imputation that I made was unfair. I thought that he would have had the same courtesy to say the things that he has just said when his colleague used the same type of language -- not language but the same type of motive imputations as I just used now. I am only too happy

MR. ROBLIN: You're the one that started it. You can dig yourself out.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I have heard that there are occasions when the First Minister has difficulty in controlling himself. I assume that it would be best if I continued with what I was saying before I was interrupted in order to maintain a sort of equilibrium in this House which is consonant with the type of debate we're supposed to have and which I have been told we ought to have.

I'll now move on to the question which I originally wanted to raise, Mr. Chairman, and that was the question of the battered babies. I find that five weeks ago I mentioned this problem when we were dealing with the estimates of the Honourable the Attorney-General, at which time he did not indicate that he was too much aware of the problem, and since which time I brought it up to him on one other occasion that I can recall. This afternoon in answer to a question raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Honourable the Attorney-General said he had no policy to announce on the question of dealing with the problem of battered babies. I think it would be best not to impute

The afternoon's Winnipeg Free Press has a report headed: "Mother Charged in Beating!"

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) and deals with the mother who will appear in the Provincial Police Court on a charge of assault occasioning bodily harm. The charge was laid after her eight year old son was found badly beaten Tuesday evening. This boy was found huddled in a corner of a curling club premises, and I presume because he was eight years old and could himself report on what happened, that a charge has been laid. The problem of the battered baby is one which is much more difficult to deal with because the child in those cases is usually of an age when it is unable to report what happened to it.

I was pleased to note from the Winnipeg Tribune of yesterday the lengthy article which was referred to by the Honourable Member from Selkirk this afternoon dealing with the meeting held on Tuesday, I believe it was, of the Medical Legal Society that there was a very extensive discussion on the entire problem of reporting suspected child beatings in order that an opportunity could be given to the authorities to investigate the possibility. I said I was pleased to note that the provincial welfare director, Mr. S. P. McArton was present at the meeting which indicates an interest by a person who, as far as I know, is not a member of the Medical Legal Society, and to the extent that this might have indicated an interest on the part of the Honourable Minister, I would look forward to hearing from him that he is interesting himself in this problem.

I do not entirely see it as a welfare matter because I think that there must be cases of battered babies which are not confined to the type of cases normally dealt with by this department. I presume that legally a child that is beaten may also be considered neglected, but I don't know that in other instances child welfare would be involved in all such cases. Therefore, I'm assuming that there's a possibility that this department will take this matter in hand, and I hope that the Honourable the Minister will deal with the question in order to assure us that he is prepared to look into it. I think that's all we could expect at this time.

I might inform him that I sent over to the Honourable the Attorney-General a pamphlet which I received, published in the United States and dealing with a resume of legislation on the problem of the battered baby, and if the Attorney-General has no particular interest or use for it, I'm sure that the Honourable the Minister could find it of interest to his department in this field.

MR. CARROLL; I want to thank my honourable friend for drawing this matter to our attention because I think it is a problem with which I'm sure all of us are interested and deeply concerned when we hear of it. Our department first became aware of this problem a little over a year ago, the first time that we had ever heard the expression "battered babies." We discussed the matter at that time with the Department of Health because of the medical implication, because in each case pretty well where the child was beaten badly enough, he became involved with some medical help to help to patch him up and put him back in shape.

The Department of Health at that time referred the matter to the Manitoba Medical Association realizing that nothing could be done in this particular field without the wholehearted support and co-operation of the medical profession. Subsequent to that a committee was established at the Children's Hospital under Dr. Medovy and they've been looking at this problem now for a number of months. I'm happy to say that there have also been committees established in other Winnipeg hospitals and that there is a cross reference at the present time being made with respect to information that comes before these committees.

The Medical Association called this meeting, which was reported in last night's paper, of the Medical Legal Committee to give this matter further airing, further discussions to see what might result from it. I talked to Dr. Elliott this morning and he indicates that there are further meetings planned, meetings which will involve the Department of Welfare, Health, the Attorney-General's Department, and the Manitoba Medical Association. They're very happy that the doctors in this province are interested in the problem. We're happy too that they have developed a means by which they can diagnose cases of abuse. They're doing something about it, and we're happy that they are now exchanging information between the various hospitals involved.

I know that there's been some controversy with respect to what action should be taken. There is a body of opinion that says when you have a battered baby that the police should be involved and that some kind of punitive action should result immediately. I think there are differences of opinion with respect to this, and this is one reason why it is a good idea to involve

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) all of the various people with an interest in the problem, because if it's known that punitive action will be taken, the father has a chance of going to jail immediately, then these particular babies aren't going to show up at hospitals. They're going to hide the evidence. The child will have to recover as best as he can at home without medical attention, I think this is something that we would certainly not want to see happen.

We're interested in the problem and will continue our interest in it, but I think it involves more than really just the government services. I think it requires the support of the community at large because this is a reflection of problems in the community. Maybe all of us should interest ourselves more, all of us as members and all of us as private citizens, because this thing is happening today, and I think it's a community effort, but I'd just like to report that our department is actively interested in it. I spoke to one of the men who attended the committee meeting the other night, the lawyer involved there, Mr. Irving Keith. He did seem to cast some aspersions at least at the social workers. I asked him if he had any specific cases in mind and he said no, he said I just seem to think that if cases like this come up I don't think there should be young social workers going out on the job. He knows of no instance in which a young social worker has been out involved in cases of battered babies, but he just seemed to feel that this was something that should go to more experienced people, and on investigation through our own department and enquiries that were made at the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, they certainly are aware of the problem and in each case do assign a senior worker, an experienced worker, a person who knows something about it. In cases where the problem does not appear to be serious and they run into more serious difficulties, immediately the more experienced help, the supervisor and others are called in.

So we are aware of the problem and we are doing something about it, and certainly I think that no further action is required at this time other than to continue our meeting to solicit and encourage greater interest among the medical profession because there is no action that can be taken without the wholehearted support of the doctors and nurses in hospitals in the Province of Manitoba. I think this is the way in which we would propose to work towards a solution of this problem in the immediate future.

MR. VIELFAURE: I was interested in hearing him say that the idea of the department was to get the best homes possible, that we should consider if we were to give up one of our children, what kind of a home we would want him to have. The family should be a proper family and that certain parents were facing restrictions when applying for adoption. However, I would like to say to him now that there are certain happenings within the department which are certainly not according to this line of thinking.

I have here a letter from one of my constituents. I won't read it all, I'll read part of it. The Minister has a copy of this letter and it says here -- here are the facts: "Peter came to our home last summer, not at our request but with our permission. He came directly from the hospital. He was only two weeks old and had never really known any home but ours. Within that first month we decided that if Peter were ever available for adoption, that we must do all that we could to try and adopt him.

"We knew that there was a time limit during which a natural mother may reclaim her child in spite of any papers she may have previously signed. Why did we hope this?

1. Because Peter was already a part of our family as much as any other of our children had ever been. One might call it a humane consideration. 2. Because we understood that in Peter's case there was no religious barrier, his mother having waived any preference as far as religion or the adoption home was concerned. 3. Because we thought that perhaps our previous service to the Children's Society in having cared for six foster children, one of them for almost three years now, might be worth some consideration. 4. Because we expressed our interest in adopting him long before we knew for certain whether he would even be for adoption or not. 5 Because we did broach the subject with our social worker who told us that we had, using his own words, "a pretty good chance of becoming Peter's adopted parents if we wished." We accepted this verbal assurance as completely as though it had been written on paper and from then on we lived in the belief that Peter was our boy.

"Not until three weeks ago did we have any indication that there was any possibility that we might not be able to keep Peter. We were told that his natural mother wanted him back and that she still had a legal right to make such a demand. When we became alarmed and said so,

(Mr. Vielfaure cont'd) we discovered that this was more or less what one might call a cover story. The plans had already been made a number of weeks or months previously to give Peter out for adoption to some other parents who had never even seen him. These plans had been made while we were living blissfully in the belief that Peter was ours. Are we not justified in feeling that we were deceived?

"Who would miss Peter the most, the parents in whose heart and family he had already taken deep root, or the parents who had never seen him until last Wednesday. Who can be most easily satisfied by a substitute baby? The mother who has grown to love him as her own baby over a period of many long months, eight months to be exact, or the mother who is still childless, has never seen this particular boy but just wants a baby. Does neither human feeling nor logic have any place in the planning of the Children's Aid Society? By what devious line of reasoning can such an action be recalled with the ideas of Christian justice upon which our laws are supposed to rest."

Now there is probably another side to this story. I do not doubt this. I tried to get it since Monday. I phoned the department and to my surprise I was told that this could happen, that they were handling many cases and that now to take the baby and bring him back to this family would just be a second wrong and two wrongs did not make one right. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't take this as an answer. In this kind of work I think one error is too much. I know that this is a hard enough job, I should say, but this is hard work for any social worker to handle these cases. There are many things that are not seen but have to be considered. However, it seems to me that if we had workers who had the experience of motherhood and fatherhood, that would know what parental love is, many of these cases would not happen. Now maybe the case was that this man was not wealthy enough, I do not know, but certainly this is not, so far as I am concerned, a serious enough reason because we know that many families who are not wealthy are very happy.

I also know of another case where a little Indian boy was taken in a foster home. Shortly after they had this little boy they realized that they loved him very much and these people decided to adopt the little boy. They were told first that they already had six kids and that one more was too much for them and that they were not financially well enough to keep him. Well I know these people. I might not be a social worker, but I know that their financial situation was really good enough, and if they accepted the responsibility of raising this little child he would be well, because their other children have been well brought up, well kept, well educated.

Then later on they were told that they were too old. They were about 40; their youngest boy was only 5 years old. Well they argued this and later on by that time the little boy was 18 months old. The worker then told them that they had done a lot of research and that they had found a home where the boy would be happier, that they had to consider the future and so on. Well these people really loved the little boy and they accepted to let him go. The little boy was away, and after four months the worker called back and asked them if they would take the little boy back, that he had just not been able to acclimatize himself to his new home, and he warned them that they would not see the same little boy that had left four months ago, that he was emotionally disturbed.

Well fortunately the little boy is back, I know him, and I think he will do all right. But my idea of bringing this up here today is that as far as I am concerned most of this is caused because of the lack of experience on the part of the workers. I do not doubt that they are sincere, that they are doing their best, but a lack of experience and a lack of knowledge of parental love I think is very important.

Now we all know that the social workers think -- like in this case here there were three social workers concerned with this little boy, so definitely it was a start over every time, and I am sure that it applies here again that experience would have lessened much of the pain and the anxieties that have existed in both these cases.

So I would strongly suggest to the Minister, and I don't doubt he is just as concerned as any one of us about the welfare of these children, that some very serious investigation should be done to see that, as far as I am concerned, where it is already in a home and that the only reason is that somebody applied before, well every consideration should be given to leaving this little child in the place where he had started his home. I don't think the fact that somebody applied before is strong enough to make it worthwhile taking from this home to another home,

(Mr. Vielfaure cont'd) and as the Honourable Member from St. Boniface suggested before tonight, the fact that he is taken away from his home, the home where he has been accustomed to at the age of eight or nine months, will definitely affect him in his future days.

So I leave these thoughts with the Minister, I'm sure that he will consider this seriously in order that the staff is lightened or trained -- not trained maybe, but as far as I am concerned they should in these cases be people that have experience in bringing up a family and in administering a budget, so that they could more easily judge the case exactly in the field.

MR. CARROLL: raising the questions which he has. I think one of the real big problems that we face in the Department of Welfare is a problem of staff. You know it seems that we all want our kids to grow up to be engineers or scientists or economists or something like that, and there are very few people who are going into the profession, the very human profession of working with people and helping them to solve their problems. Unfortunately, we rely to a large extent on young ladies. Quite a few of them are attractive young ladies who decide quite naturally to get married and to leave the social work profession for a period of time. We wish, we sincerely wish we could attract more young people who are wanting to work with people to help improve the lives of others, because this is really one of the weaknesses of the Department of Welfare, to get properly qualified people, people who have an ambition to go out and work with others, and you have touched on it in indicating that here was a situation in which this one particular Indian boy had three different social workers. I don't know over what period of time -- (interjection) -- over 18 months, and it's quite possible.

MR. PAULLEY: Have you considered paying them sufficient salaries to make the job attractive to them?

MR. CARROLL: I don't know what kind of salaries attract people to a profession if they don't have a liking for people. I think this is a real problem. We have always emphasized the more glamorous kinds of professions and we have given very little thought -- in fact I would just like to mention this -- I was sitting alongside Alderman Edith Tennant at a banquet a couple of weeks ago and she told me that one of the real problems down at City Council was to get somebody to work on the welfare committee. All the members of council shied away from the welfare committee, because of course this means involving yourself in problems of people and there's something nasty about this word welfare. There's a stigma attaches to it, and I think that this is -- and we had better all search our souls a little bit because quite a few of the members of this House have made derogatory statements about this terrible welfare state and the abuses of welfare and people are giving away money like water and so on, and we are really going to tell the government when we get to the welfare department estimates about how they are squandering and wasting money. This is rubbing off on the public. They say there must be something wrong with welfare as a profession. These are only do-gooders.

Well let me tell you this is only part of the problem. But it is a very real problem, we're aware of it, and I thank my honourable friend for drawing this to our attention, I did get a copy of the letter that he referred to. It arrived at my office on the 6th of April and I referred it to the department for investigation -- it arrived on the sixth of April, that's Monday of this week, and I have a report dated the 9th of April and I would like to read it because I think it sheds some light on this particular problem. This was handled in the eastern -- the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba, which is an organization of volunteers run by private citizens, well-meaning citizens, people who are doing their best for the young people that come into their charges. These are all good people trying to help to solve a problem and I wish that more of us could get involved in this kind of work because it's real stimulating to see people who are reaching out and trying to help others in trouble.

I'd like to just read the report that I got from our Director of Child Welfare on this particular case. "I have discussed this letter with the society and wish to report the following. Mr. and Mrs. X" and I'll use that in place of the regular name -- "have been foster parents for the society since 1960, and during that time have cared for six children. They are excellent foster parents with a great deal of understanding and the society values their services highly. The child in question was placed with them on a foster home basis on August 18th, and placed for adoption last week. The child was a non-ward." In other words, he wasn't a responsibility. He wasn't taken in as a neglected child or left -- it was a voluntary admission through this particular society. "The child was a non-ward and was originally placed with them for a

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) temporary period while the mother of the child decided on a permanent plan. The mother did not make this decision until late December when the child became available for adoption" -- late December. "At no time either before or after the placement of the child did the foster parents file an application for adoption, and only expressed an interest in adopting the child in March. By this time the society had chosen an adoption home for the child and proceedings to effect this adoption placement had begun. The society is sorry that a misunderstanding has occurred. It is natural for foster parents to become attracted to children to whom they have given so much and to feel a real sense of loss when children are returned to their parents for a place in permanent adopting home. This is thoroughly discussed with all foster parents during the time of the study of their application."

MR. VIELFAURE: I imagine that here is -- I'm not familiar with this, but I imagine what happened here is there must have been a change of social worker again, because after two weeks he tells me that he -- that it was probably a verbal agreement, or verbal understanding with the social worker -- that they wanted to adopt this baby and they were told then that they had a very good chance, and they lived with this idea all through the time until March, as you said, when they were informed that the child would be taken away, and then I would imagine they made a written application. But I am sure that after -- the gentleman himself told me, and I'm sure he was sincere when he said it -- that after two weeks they realized they really loved the child and verbally told the social worker that they intended to keep the child.

MR. CARROLL: Well as I understand this, the mother had fully intended to make other arrangements for that child but in late December, late December decided that she couldn't make those arrangements and decided to give out the child. Now obviously this may not be the full story. This is the story that has probably been taken from the record of that child in the office of the Children's Aid Society of Eastern Manitoba and the story as has been related to us. Now if you want further particulars I'll be very happy to try to get them for you. I regret that I don't have any information at all upon the other case that you mentioned.

However, I would like to say this, that if any of you have problems with respect to cases of this kind, if you would refer them to me I'd be very happy to look into them for you. It appears that the Member for St. Boniface gets a great many complaints along this line. I will say this, I think I've only had two complaints in the year that I've been in this particular job. That doesn't mean there haven't been many other complaints but -- I think there have only been two that have come to my direct attention with respect to a situation such as this. But I'd be very happy to try and get further particulars, and I'll say this that I've never found a case in which the agency or the social worker involved wasn't trying honestly and sincerely to do the best they can for that particular child.

MR. PAULLEY: The Minister mentioned the fact that he has a desire of having more people take an interest in the field of social work, and I would like to make a suggestion to my honourable friend in this regard as to where he may -- an interest in the field of social work -- and that is in the University of the Province of Manitoba. I had a young lady last year who applied for the -- during the summer recess -- she felt that her destiny in life was to be a social worker and she applied in the various departments in the Province of Manitoba for a job during the summer recess from university without avail. She did eventually -- may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I had mentioned this to the Minister of Welfare in the Province of Saskatchewan. I have a little connection there and the Minister there said to me that he would be more than willing to have a student from Manitoba join their department for the summer holidays, and the net result was that this student, who was at that time I believe in her third year at the university, went to the Province of Saskatchewan, was given a job for the summer holidays in Saskatchewan in the Department of Welfare, and will be going back after graduation into the field of social work in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now I noticed the other day Mr. Chairman, that one of the directors of the Unemployment Commission -- or Employment Commission of Canada, while he was here in Winnipeg stated that it was beginning to be quite a problem for the placement of university students during the summer holidays. As a matter of fact, his suggestion was that maybe universities should carry on for an eleven-month period rather than the present one. So I suggest to the Minister that it might be that he would be able to induce a number of the students at the university to join his department during the summer holidays to get an insight into the problems of a social

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) worker, and by doing so, what the Minister is after, create a great interest in the field of social work, and I agree with him.

I agree with him that it's regrettable, the attitude of the number of people to the field of social work, but I would suggest to him the examinations are being written at the present time at the university; there will be soon a number of students at the university who will be looking for employment; and I suggest to my honourable friend that this is the time where he might put on the notice boards in the various colleges and affiliates of the university that here is an opportunity for students to work in the field of social work, which is very important during the summer holidays, and by doing this I am sure that he might be able to attract into this very important facet of human endeavour students from our universities.

The other one is of course as I interjected a few moments ago insofar as the males in particular are concerned, because I agree with my honourable friend that many of the females who naturally have an instinct to this field take it up and then they become married and leave the field, and I do suggest to my honourable friend if he were to pay here in the Province of Manitoba comparable salaries which are being paid let us say in the Province of Saskatchewan for male social workers, that he may not have the problem that he's got here.

So I'm attempting at this time, at least to be a little more constructive in the I am quite frequently, Mr. Chairman, but I do think that he can, if he takes my advice and has the proper authority at the university put on the notice board there that the Department of Welfare in the Province of Manitoba invites students during their holidays to join the department of Welfare to look into the field of welfare and social workers, that he'll have a considerable number of applicants and it might be, if he only does this for a year or two, that the Minister will not be in the unfortunate position of having to stand up in this House and say well darn it all, I'd love to do so many things but people just aren't interested. I'm sure they're interested and are willing to do it if the Honourable Minister will co-operate as far as he is concerned by giving them an invitation into the field.

MR. CARROLL: I think we do take on a great many summer students, people waiting to complete their university courses and things like that, and this is very helpful in getting people who will ultimately select this as their profession and continue on. But I would like to say too that Manitoba isn't alone among the provinces in having problems of getting staff, at least properly qualified and professional staff to work in this particular field. We do have here in Manitoba a very good bursary scheme in which we send people within the department to complete their professional training. I think each year we have had something like \$15,000 in bursaries to members of the department who are wanting to further their education to become properly qualified, and these are ways by which we hope to attract more people into the profession and so on. I really don't know at the moment how our salaries compare with other provinces, but that's something very interesting and we'll look into it some time in the future.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, first of all I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for suggesting he would look into any complaints we might have on this. I think this is a very good idea and I think this certainly will help.

The Leader of the NDP was suggesting certain things trying to get more people in the profession. I think he had some good points but there is the fact that the Minister said many of these young ladies are leaving to get married and I don't think that any salary will keep some of them. It might be an idea though to try to induce more men to go in this profession if it's at all possible. Like the Honourable Minister said that this is considered more of a "do-gooders" profession. It might be but I think that this could change now. We need too many of them. But that only proves that we need something that I suggested a while ago, more education in this field. The Minister -- I think we should educate the public and ask for better co-operation in all this and I'd like to see the Minister think about this. I'm sure you'd have complete co-operation of the press on this. Let the people know the routine and the reasons for this.

Now there's something -- the Honourable Minister stood up and I think at the last count we agreed on two things and we didn't agree on the third one. Staying on this adoption matter for awhile he felt that some of these questions that I was referring about, I thought that he treated this very lightly, he took it that they were routine questions. Then he proceeded to tell us how important these questions were. They should be asked. Well, there was no need for that

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) because I started by stating that I understood this and that I agreed with him. But I don't agree with him when he says that these questions are routine. I don't think that people that delve into your sex life and want to know how often you indulge in sex in a year, or in a month, I don't think that this is a routine question. Again I'm saying that maybe there 's a need for that. But I don't think that this is a routine question. And I would say to the Minister -- I won't mention the name now, but I'll give him the name privately if he wishes -- that one of his key men -- the man who is no longer there in his own department -- a social worker himself, who already had an adopted child, complained about this and he asked the social worker how she'd like it if he asked her the same question. The man is a social worker himself, a very capable man, a man that you praised yesterday and today, and he didn't like this at all. Mind you 90 percent of the people might not object but with some people it is a big barrier. They don't like this; they don't like to answer questions about their personal life. I think that the education would help some of them. If you'd make them realize that you're not trying to pry in their affairs that this is a need. But then if these people refuse, if this is the only thing and some of them were stopped right there by this, they will not answer this, and if they refuse, in fact we are losing in some instances very good prospective parents and I think that they should be allowed to go to a doctor, or that a doctor would work with the government, or an older social worker, a supervisor of some kind, but I just ask the Minister to look into this. And this is serious. As I say one of his members, a social worker himself, refused to answer these questions. I didn't have to be told that these questions are important. I'm very sure that nobody likes to ask these questions. Probably the blushing of some of these young ladies makes it even more difficult.

And now the honourable Minister mentioned that in the summer he will at last try to get rid of all this backlog, which is something good, I agree with this. I'm not going to say one minute you're far behind but don't do anything about it, but I hope that he's not going to have these first year students asking these questions. I hope that he's going to think about this twice before -- I think the Minister should look into it. This is not an accusation. Everybody's doing their best, I've talked to some of them. I've talked to some of these people who are working there and they're doing their best. I know that. But they meet all kinds of people; people who don't understand; people who feel there's something wrong with them because they're suggesting that they should see a psychologist -- and those people we should take the trouble. The Minister said awhile ago he needs people to work with people. Well, we should take the trouble not to lose these people because sometimes they're the best. So this is the only thing. In this adoption I give credit to the Minister in doing everything he can, but last year he treated these questions lightly and this year again. And I don't think that this is quite fair. Maybe it doesn't happen too often but it certainly happens quite a few times and some people take this thing very seriously. So I want to emphasize this again and if he wants -- if he hasn't guessed the name of the person I talked about -- if he wants to know the name of this man privately, I'll tell him, and he can discuss it with him because I think it would help him.

There's something else, the thing that we didn't hit off, completely, we didn't agree was on this question of the Indian and Metis. He told me that he was very disappointed that I didn't understand then he mixed me up more than anything else because he was on both sides. This is what I don't understand. I never suggested that we should stop people from coming in. But I think we're kidding ourselves when we say these people definitely all want to leave. Those with ambition want to leave the Reserve. They want to leave, some of the best ones they want to leave because they want a job and there's no work given them, and I still think we would learn an awful lot, we would gain an awful lot if we tried to bring industry to them, and these people are very, very agile with their hands for instance. How many watches come in and the movements come in and they have to be assembled. It wouldn't take very long for these people to be experts in this, and this kind of work, because you can't take people away from their homes. You have some young girls 18 around here. You see them in some parts of the north end near the subway and so on. Some of these Indian girls.

MR. PETERS: I reject that

MR. DESJARDINS: Well he might reject it all he wants but I seen some there evenings. So I think those people are in the place that you're trying to change. I wonder if the Honourable Member would wait a little while before he makes such a speech.

MR. PETERS: I'm not making a speech but don't reflect on the north end of Winnipeg. Take St. Boniface into consideration too.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, if the honourable member is finished, as I was saying, you see all kinds of them near the subway in Winnipeg that are running around there and they are not helping themselves. Some of these girls are driven into prostitution -- and there's a lot of them -- because they are leaving a home and they're not used, as I said a while ago, they're thrown into a jungle. And I'm not going to go at any length into this because I think that the Leader of the Official Opposition has something to add on this, but let's get this thing straight. I'm not suggesting that we will force them to stay on the Reserve. I'm not suggesting that but I don't think that we should force them to have to leave the Reserve. This was my point, that they should be forced to leave the Reserve to get any work. It's their home the same as our own children, and so on, and we're not fussy about our children having to leave home to go to work. All right when the whole family moves it is a little different, and we will encourage them because we will bring a certain part of civilization back to them. But my point was not to rush it and to realize that their homes are important to them. We might think that they're shacks and so on, but I think that their homes and this home life -- they need security -- this is the only security they have. My point wasn't that nothing is being done for these people, and that they should never, that we should put a wall around the Reserve, and they shouldn't be outside. That's not my point at all. My point is that we can bring some work -- and I think it would be well for the industry here in Manitoba. I think if a survey, if a study was made of this, I think that we would certainly realize that this would be something good, for Manitoba, for the industry, and certainly for the Indian and Metis themselves. So I wanted to straighten out this point because I wasn't running down the work that is being done but I think this is a new aspect and I still repeat that we have to look at this problem through their eyes. We can't just say that this is the way we want you to be, therefore you follow this way. This is not right, we have to remember the kind of people they are. Instead of calling them shifty and so on, they're used to this. This is their way of life. Part of their life was fishing. What happened to the fishing industry as far as the Indians are concerned here? I think we robbed them. You have to be quite a rich fisherman before you can do any commercial fishing around here. There is no chance, practically no chance for the Indian because he can't buy the proper equipment. We took this thing away from them and then we call them shifty. And then they have to leave the Reserve. This is my point. Let's bring something to them. Let's look at these things and let them work within the confine of their own secure homes. This is the point that I was trying to make.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman before we get too far away from, I would agree that if it were possible to take industry to Indian Reserves or Metis settlements in the Province of Manitoba, we'd do everything we could to do it, and we're doing just that. We're doing just that. The Minister of Industry and Commerce over here is working full speed with his department trying to get industry to move to rural Manitoba today. So I'd just like to ask you, what's happening today to the young people from Flin Flon, from The Pas, from Swan River, from Dauphin, from Gimli, from anywhere in Manitoba? Those young kids aren't getting employment in their homes. They're moving out to where employment is. That employment happens to be in the City of Winnipeg, or it might happen to be in Northern Manitoba, or some other place. But the employment isn't in these rural areas and we're trying hard to attract industry there.

But let's just look at the magnitude of the problem. You mention fishing. The COMEF report says we have 5,000 fishermen on Lake Winnipeg today and if that Lake is to be operated efficiently we should have only 1500. That means we've got to look for 3,500 jobs for those Indians around Lake Manitoba. You show me the kind of industry that we can attract in there in time to replace those jobs. Mister, I'd really like to see that because it's going to be a real difficult thing to do, and remember these people are increasing in population at twice the rate of the rest of our society. We're going to have to run pretty hard to try and provide employment for the increasing number of Indians. We've got what -- 50,000 Indians and Metis in the province today? By 1975 we'll probably have 100,000. Try to find industry sufficient to operate in most cases in uneconomic areas to provide employment for those people. When you look at this problem long enough, you begin to realize that the ultimate solution lies in developing the local

(Mr. Carroll cont'd)resources as best you can; attracting industry as best you can. But ultimately a lot of these people are going to have to integrate or we're going to have a bigger problem than we've ever had before.

These are some of the things we mentioned. We aren't trying to force them out. We're trying to help them; help those who want to come out. But these people are looking at the hard facts of life today and deciding on their own that this is what they are going to have to do if they want a better life for their children and a better future for themselves.

Now you mentioned that I take your complaints frivolously -- lightly. I really don't think I did. With respect to adoptions -- now we're getting off the Indian question for just a moment. I think, what I say is they try to ask routine questions to find out whether this is a good home for a child. They try to find out whether it is a happy home, and in the course of their discussions they meet with them together, they meet with them separately, and they get to know a lot about these people, and they have to ask personal questions. They may find something just by a slip of the tongue that leads them to ask more probing questions and more embarrassing questions, and I can bet that no one wants to ask these personal questions but there is nothing more personal than placing a child in a home, in someone else's home. That's a big responsibility, and I would think that if I were going to place one of my children in a home I'd want to know a great deal about those parents and I'd want to ask a great many questions and I'd want to know a lot about their personal life. Now I'm not sure that sex life is all that important, but I want to know it's a happy home and I want to know that my child will have a chance to grow up and be a happy and useful citizen in that home; that he will be loved by those people, and that's the kind of affection that he needs to grow up in a mature and satisfactory way. So these are the reasons why we get into some of these areas. There may be some who ask questions that they shouldn't -- I don't know. But we have had really very few complaints, very few complaints; and I think the placements by and large have been most satisfactory.

MR. MOLGAT: I was very interested in the comments of the Minister on the matter of community development, because I have been very interested in community development for many years. I think the House will remember, at least the members who were there then, that the then member for St. Boniface, the present Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Hon. Roger Teillet, originally brought into this House the resolution that led to the establishment of the Lagasse Commission and the report that they brought in, which I think is an excellent report, and I commend the government quite heartily on their acceptance of this report and the work that they have done in developing community development here in Manitoba. I think they have made good progress, but I don't think Mr. Chairman, that we can rest on what has been accomplished. I think that we have a great deal more to do and I think the Indians themselves are the first ones who are saying this right now.

The Minister was saying earlier that the Member from St. Boniface didn't know what was going on. Well it seems to me that the people whom we are trying to help have not found out yet exactly what the program is, and that the department in spite of its efforts has not accomplished what needs to be done. I'm quoting here, Mr. Chairman, from the Winnipeg Tribune, Wednesday, January 15, 1964. The heading is "Please Please Help us Northern Indians Beg Roblin" and the story says: "The year-old 52-men Churchill Indian and Metis Council has sent a sharp letter to Premier Duff Roblin asking for help in solving problems, most of them associated with drinking."

The letter follows: "We are writing to you because we do not know what to do. There are many Cree, Chippewyan and Eskimo people who drink up here. The jail gets so packed with people that they sometimes cannot lay down. The men and women are in the same room and the toilet is out in the open. When our people go to court there are no interpreters, and they do not know what they should do or say even if they did understand English. The only time we are treated like white men is when we are fined. Some of our people cannot pay their fines and are sent to jail. It would be good if our people could all be sent out during the winter months because some of the jails in the south are warm, have clean beds, three meals a day and TV. The only other time we get favors from the white man is during election time. This is usually in the form of food, booze or money." And the letter goes on.

Mr. Chairman, obviously our community development ideas have not reached these people as yet. Now last year, Mr. Chairman, following on one of their statements there, that "the only

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) other time we get favors from the white man is during election time" -- in December a year ago there was a considerable flurry -- that is a year ago last December -- because there were two by-elections or two deferred elections in the north and there was some fast action then. Here's a clipping then: "Quick Start Set on Indian Projects" and we were going to build roads into Nelson House and we were going to build an airstrip for them and so on, but since then, Mr. Chairman, I haven't heard of too many projects and the Indians are the first to say that what they want, Mr. Chairman, is work. I'm quoting here from statements made then -- this is December 29, 1962 in the Tribune, the Chief I believe of the Nelson House band: "We are starving for jobs not food." He goes on to say that the government, the Salvation Army has supplied his people with needed food "but we came here to bring our problem that we need training for work. We are starving for work." This is where, Mr. Chairman, we have a great deal more to do.

Now in fairness to the Minister I must say that recently in my own constituency a project was undertaken that was an excellent project. The Hydro are building a transmission line from the Grand Rapids project across the Narrows in Lake Manitoba. The Indians in the area approached me to see if it would be possible to get the work done by hand labour rather than by contract. I contacted the Hydro officials and the Welfare people co-operated in this; the project was undertaken. The Hydro agreed that insofar as that portion of the work that was in the unorganized territory they would do it by hand labour, and I commend in this case the community development group and in particular the man who was responsible in the area, Mr. John Allard, for the excellent work that was done, and I'm sure Mr. Chairman that far from costing money that whole project saved money. I would estimate, Mr. Chairman, having a reasonably good idea of how much it has cost us in the past in the Ebb and Flow area in that region for welfare, that we probably saved by giving these people work rather than welfare, we probably saved something in the vicinity of four to five to six thousand dollars, and Mr. Chairman, more important than that, these people worked; they were happy to work. The whole environment in that Reserve and in that area was improved substantially by the fact that they were being employed.

Now the Minister says it's hard to get employment into these areas. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to quote at this time from what the United States are doing, and I think the problem there is very similar to ours. Quoting first, Mr. Chairman, from an article that appeared in the Rocky Mountain Oil Reporter. This is September 1962 and this is covering the events "Look What's Happening These Days on Indian Land." Well we know that in the United States a number of the reservations are extremely wealthy because of oil deposits that were found there, but the article goes on to say: "Rich as they are in resources, the need of the Indian is even greater. Their per capita income is still pitifully small. They number" -- and this is the American situation; I'm giving this as background because it indicates that their problem is identical to ours. "They number half a million now, twice as many as in 1900, and are the least vanishing part of the American population. About 360,000 of them still live on the reservations, the other 160,000 or so in other areas. The long fight against illness and illiteracy is being won. Now there is more emphasis on adult vocational training and the drive to dispel poverty especially by development of tribal resources."

Then Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from a letter from the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C. and it's a letter written in December. It says to a businessman: "This is our invitation to you to discover how the Indian Industrial Development Program can assist you in selecting the best location for your next facility. A significant number of manufacturers have taken advantage of our program and have located one or more profitable operations on or near Indian reservations. They have made their choice from among the more than 300 communities participating in the program. Besides affording the location advantages of labour supply, markets and transportation, our Indian Industrial Development program assists you with such factors as financing, site selection, erection of buildings to your specifications and partial reimbursement of on-the-job training costs of Indian employees, all of which contribute to any successful expansion or plant location. One of our staff of professional Industrial Development specialists will be happy to outline for you just how our program can brighten your profit picture. Needless to say, your interest will be held in strictest confidence. If you will let us know what date suits you best we will meet with

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) you to discuss your plans and how our Indian Industrial Development program can assist you. Sincerely yours, Mr., Chief, Branch of Industrial Development. "

There's what the United States is doing, Mr. Chairman. They have set up within their Indian Affairs, and this I realize is on the Federal basis, but we have here in the province a responsibility towards the non-treaty Indians and I think we are achieving more co-operation with the federal government insofar as the treaty Indians. There's what the United States are doing. They have a Department specifically organized to do this and, Mr. Chairman, it's been highly successful.

This is quoting again from the story in the Rocky Mountain Oil Reporter. "The American government took an Indian, Mr. Keeler, who headed a task force of distinguished citizens, who made a 15,000 mile, 5-month intensive study of Indian affairs and produced what is entitled 'A program for Indian Citizens.' This was adopted by the Kennedy administration as the chart and guide in an about-face in the government's Indian policy. The new program is one the Indians like and respect because it safeguards their heritage while they are developing their own resources. The new trail is leading them into economic self-sufficiency, fully matching that of other American citizens. Manufacturing projects featuring Indian craftsmen are an outstanding development on many reservations since the Kennedy administration launched its drive to whip the problems of chronic unemployment. Industrial Development specialists in the Indian Bureau, aided by other agencies, canvassed thousands of manufacturers to ferret out those interested in establishing factories to utilize Indian workers. "

Mr. Chairman, this then lists a whole series of plants that have been established, and the surprising thing that in the list a large number of them, Mr. Chairman, are in the area immediately adjoining the Province of Manitoba, just here in the northern States. Here, for example, is one: "The idea appealed to Wright and McGill of Denver Colorado a long-established maker of fishhooks and other equipment for sports. Three factories were set up on the ... Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. More than 600 Indians have been taught new skills and work habits and current payrolls average 200, among people whose best previous jobs were digging potatoes and other seasonal agricultural work far from home." Exactly the same story as we have here in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, where our present Indian and Metis by and large have to depend on seasonal employment, away from their homes and usually at much lower rates of pay. Even in this particular case, in the case of Wright and McGill, even the plant superintendents are Indian.

Adjoining the Turtle Mountain reservation in North Dakota, Mr. Chairman -- this is directly south of Brandon -- the Bulova Watch Company makes jewel bearings for precision instruments, used largely for defense purposes. Highly trained Chippewa Indians -- the Chippewa Indians in the Northern States are the ones that we call Saulteux Indians here, who form the largest part of the Indians in the southern part of Manitoba -- so highly trained Chippewa Indians provide the work force, meeting a critical industrial need. Not far away, near Botineau, again directly adjoining the Province of Manitoba, the Dakota Wood Products Company has Indian crews producing laths used in snow fences. At the Standing Rock Reservation the Sioux workers process over 30,000 pounds of milk per day in the cheese plant of the Selfridge Five Star Cheese Corporation. Plastics and jewellery items are made in a new plant in Montana on the northern Cheyenne Reservation employing about 85 Indians this fall. Another plastics plant in southeastern Oklahoma was built by the Seminole Indians and leased to a manufacturer who provides jobs. On the Flathead Reservation in Montana, saw mill waste products are made into charcoal briquets by Indian crews. In South Dakota, in McLaughlin, an important quilting factory is operated with Indian staffs by the H Corporation of Cleveland, Ohio, which operates another Indian plant at Cherokee, North Carolina. In Wisconsin, a basket factory on the Lac Courte Orielles Reservation employs several Indians.

There, Mr. Chairman, is a program that was developed and is working in an area close to the Province of Manitoba, with, in a number of cases, Indians of exactly the same tribes as those inhabiting the Province of Manitoba. This was done by an aggressive program by the federal government there, to induce manufacturers to locate in these areas, and it has been successful, Mr. Chairman. So I say to the Minister that we shouldn't be looking simply in these areas at work or employment dealing strictly with the resources of the area itself, because

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) he's right when he says that by and large the resources in the areas where we have reservations are extremely limited, that if we are going to depend on those local resources for employment then we'll be waiting a long, long time. But through the Department of Industry and Commerce and the attempts that they are making to bring employment to Manitoba, I think that we have here a guideline, Mr. Chairman, towards better employment for our Indian and Metis population by the location of plants in the vicinity of the reservation, where the manufacturer will know that he has a steady source of labour and with incentives that we can be doing a job that in the final analysis will save money for the Province of Manitoba and rehabilitate people who need this exact type of work.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I think one of our biggest problems here in Manitoba is that we started from so far back -- we were way back in the Stone Age in our thinking and dealing with people of Indian origin -- that we have a lot of catching up to do, and I think the letter that he read from the Indian Council in Churchill is an indication of the kind of work that has taken place as a result of our community development program in Churchill, because I venture to say that letter would never have come out of Churchill five years ago or ten years ago or even three years ago. That letter came out of Churchill because these people now are doing something for themselves. They've organized themselves because they've had some leadership in that area. Do you think the Indian people of Manitoba don't know about our Community Development Program? I would invite you to go to the Indian-Metis Conference next year and see whether the Indian people and the Metis people of Manitoba know about the Community Development Program. I invite you to go to a meeting of the National Indian Council where they're talking about the Community Development Program in the Province of Manitoba. I would invite you to go to the Indian-Eskimo Association where they're talking about the work that's being done in Manitoba in the Community Development Program. But I'm not saying that we've done very much. We've just scratched the surface in this field and this is such a big field it's going to take a long time and there's an awful lot of catching up to do, but I invite my friend to consider the difference in geography between the barren pre-Cambrian Shield, barren in the way of population and markets to support the products of industry. I invite you to consider that kind of geography compared with the locations that he read about here tonight, and see if there isn't a vast difference between the locations and between the situations that exist there. But I invite you also to reflect on the work that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is doing to try and get industry in Manitoba, to make money available, to make technical assistance available, to try and attract industry here, and I think you would agree that this is one of the aims, to try and develop industry in those northern areas. I'd like to say that one of their projects, in particular I know, is one that has been aimed at northern Manitoba and I know they've spent countless hours and hours of staff work at the very highest level trying to develop industry in these areas that we're talking about, and while they haven't been successful I take my hat off to them for the effort that they've put into this.

You talk about the things that are happening there. Things are happening in Manitoba too, and I invite you to go out and see some of the results of Community Development work. I'd like to tell you about the Metis people in the vicinity around The Pas. For years and years these people's only income might have been from their trapping, very little fishing in those particular parts of the country. They might have got a little -- they did get the odd bit of summer labour wherever they could get it; but they were largely supported by the Welfare Department of this province and I know that. And these people, following the pattern that was established at Berens River -- and we had the Berens River story and surely you haven't forgotten the wonderful success story at Berens River told to us here just a couple of years ago, about how those people went through a winter for the first time in the history of that community without getting the assistance of welfare. Well, we had a Community Development Program in The Pas and they established these Metis people, some of them who still believe in witch doctors, if you please. These people are way back and they got together and they organized themselves into a pulpwood co-op and they had success with the small co-op project, and over this last winter they embarked upon a project which will bring them in something like \$35,000 and they had the whole of that community organized and working, every man of them out on that job, young and old alike. For the first time in their lives they showed this kind of initiative. They rallied the

(Mr. Carroll cont'd) support of all of the community to go out and embark on a program of self-employment, and we don't know yet whether it is going to be a financial success. There's still some doubt about it, but certainly if you want to consider the savings in welfare, if you want to consider what it has done for the morale of those people to be standing on their own feet, earning their own way, paying their own bills, it's been a tremendous success; and I want you to just remember for a moment the experiment that was conducted in The Pas. I'd like to tell you about an experiment conducted there by the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, and this was their approach at that time -- Indian Affairs -- they went in and said to the Indian people, "We think you should go farming because farming would be good for your people," so they bought a beautiful farm out in the Pasquia Project there, the finest farming land in Manitoba, bar none -- the best land in Manitoba. And could they get those people to go farming? No! Because those people hadn't decided themselves that this was what they wanted to do.

But let's look at what these Metis people are doing, the same people who've maybe just gone off treaty, who've bought themselves out of treaty, living on the fringes of The Pas Reserve. They're coming to us now and saying, "We want a piece of that farm land out in the Pasquia Valley because we want to go in there and prove that we can farm along with the white man. We want to go in there and prove that we can do these things." Think of the difference between the kind of success those people would have and the success that was reflected in the experience of the Department of Indian Affairs just eight or ten years ago.

I'd like to say, too, that we're building a technical school at The Pas, and that technical school is geared to meet the needs of those northern people, to help to equip them to take advantage of job opportunities if job opportunities ever present themselves in the north. If they don't present themselves there those people are going to prepare themselves to come and work outside because they want to move out. They want employment; and you read the very letter yourself tonight. These people want jobs and we're prepared to help them get jobs in the program that's before us here tonight.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, . . . a point. What I was saying to the Minister is that he has started, that's true in the community development, but he said specifically, Mr. Chairman, his comments, that it's difficult to get factories and employment in the areas where the reservations are because there aren't any resources. I was pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that the Americans have the same problem. There are no more resources at the reservation in Bontineau than there is at the reservation at Lac du Bonnet or in my own constituency at Sandy Bay or Ebb and Flow. It's exactly the same problem. Not all the reservations are in northern Manitoba in the pre-Cambrian Shield. A large number of the reservations in Manitoba are within 200 miles of Winnipeg in perfectly accessible areas with good transportation and facilities, and what I'm saying to the Minister is, don't just consider programs based on local resources. Here is a guide line in what the Americans have done. Let us look at bringing in factories that have nothing to do with the local resources, because you have a special project there or special possibilities with a labour force both male and female. I agree with the Minister insofar as the farming structure. I don't think it can work. I don't think it will work to break up the reservations into small plots because we know how difficult it is today in agriculture even for a person well-qualified, well-trained and with capital, what a tough time it is to make a go at agriculture. This isn't the answer for the Indian population in Manitoba, but for him to say simply, "Oh well, we've got a Berens River Project" and so on, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that he has attacked this in the way the Americans are doing right now with a planned program to bring in outside industry to those specific areas.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution, has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.