

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 24, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 88 - (a) -- The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. STEINKOPF: Just as we adjourned, I was being queried on the matters to do with the pension plan. There is an increase in the normal superannuation of \$115,000, and this is the normal increase that is made every year to the superannuation fund, although it is somewhat higher than what it normally is. The reason is that there are some pensions of a larger nature being paid in 1966-67 than in past years and, as you know, the fund is now operating on a funded basis. This is what threw up the larger amount but it strictly is an actuarial figure based on retirements that are taking place now and that is why the amount is \$115,000.

The amount of \$500,000 that is shown as the Canada Pension Plan contribution is a recurring cost and this represents the province's share of the 3.6 contribution that is made - 1.8 by the employee and the other 1.8 by the employer. The actual cost in the long run will not be any greater to the province because the total contribution of the province is still set at six percent but it has to be paid yearly now rather than non-funded when the pensions become due.

During the adjournment and the recess, I was able to have the department do a little checking on that civil service matter that was brought up by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and so far we have been unable to find any record of the four applications that were supposed to have been made to the department nor have we been able to find an offer of a job for the individual that was stated.

A matter like this is a very serious one and has a lot of implications that are not immediately obvious at the time, and I doubt and I wonder if I were in the position of the Honourable Member for Gladstone if I would have brought the matter out so publicly without having first ascertained a little bit more about the facts of the matter. I notice that he did say, and I believe he said that he could not make out the sender's name, but after seeing the letter, the copy that I was handed, I wonder if there ever was a name on the letter. There was, but the obliteration seems to be pretty solid and it would seem that it was done on purpose. It is very difficult to detect any writing under the obliteration and as there is no envelope from which the matter could be traced, I would think the only possible way now would be to find the actual typewriter that typed the letter.

A charge as serious as this, if made outside of these Chambers might be considered slanderous because there is an individual who has been charged and named. It is so serious that I would question the advisability again of proceeding in such a public manner. It also must be a reflection on not only the individual that is concerned but the department and the Minister who is responsible for that department and of course the government itself, and I decry any suggestion of discrimination in others just as much as I would hate to have anyone point a finger in that respect to me, and all I can say is that we will leave no stone unturned to get to the bottom of it and to see if the charges that have been made are true, and if they are, proper action will be taken.

But I hope - I suggest that it would have been a more proper procedure to have brought the letter in the first instance to either the person's attention or to the Minister's attention, and if no action had been forthcoming, then to have brought the matter out in the way it was. As soon as I get a final report on the matter, I will again report to the honourable member but I hope that he will permit me the opportunity of making it to him personally rather than making it across the floor of this House.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I hope my honourable friend is not suggesting that I fabricated the letter and then signed the name to it because the original letter is - I can obtain it - it looks as if it had been signed first in pencil and then blurred out and written in ink, and I will attempt to -- well I know where the original letter is and I will get it for you and you can have a look at it yourself if you like, but it's -- I don't know, I can't figure out the name. It could be several names but certainly it was not my imagination. I got the letter - I think I said the letter was written on Feb. 16, likely I received it on the 17th or 18th or about that time, and I certainly got it from the post office here along with my regular mail. I confess that I did not keep the envelope. As I do with a lot of others, I heaved them in the wastepaper basket and I have no way of tracing the postmark that was on the envelope. I can't do that now but I thought that it should be brought to the attention of the House because it has been suggested to me, and certainly no doubt my honourable friend has heard it suggested on more than one occasion that

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) there is discrimination. They say that about every government in the hiring, and they also say - they say to me, and I don't think there's a member of this House that hasn't heard it said at some time or another about some government, that there is discrimination in the hiring and that there is, in fact, priority. It has been said - whether there's any grounds for it or not, well that's another matter - but it certainly has been said and I've heard it on several occasions and I'm certain that everyone in the House has heard it. Now whether it is true, Mr. Chairman, or false - true or false - that has to be established. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur): It was said this afternoon. Who said it? Who signed the letter or was it signed?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Who signed it? Who signed it? I'm not certain. I will get the original letter. If my honourable friends want to see the original letter, I will get it for you and every person in the House can have a look at the original letter if they want to. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you want the original letter tabled,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Table the letter please.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Have you not received a copy of the letter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. STEINKOPF: I have received a copy of the letter.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Is that sufficient or would you like a copy as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no letter tabled.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to disassociate myself from that last remark that we've all heard about discrimination in the civil service. I have only been connected with it some two and a half years and there have been complaints of one kind or another but never have I had one, either directly or indirectly, of discrimination, and I would be quite free and frank to tell the House that I have. I have had some jocular comments made, and I think even in the House, about the method of employment and it may be construed as discrimination, but certainly a discrimination of a different type entirely than what we're talking about here. That, as you know, has to do with one's political stripe rather than what one's colour is and this has only been done in jest, because I think our civil service in the Province of Manitoba has been so free of both of these types of so-called discriminations ever since I've been close to the Province of Manitoba and those who've had the duty of looking after the interests of the civil service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 88 -- passed; Resolution No. 89 -- passed; Resolution No. 90 -- passed; Resolution No. 91 -- passed; Resolution No. 92 -- passed; Resolution No. 93 --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I had some comments to make on 93. I'm very interested in the way that this organization keeps growing so far as expenditure is concerned. It's been with us a long time and I listened to my honourable friend's remarks regarding it this afternoon. I can realize the position that he's in when he's discussing it because to quite an extent it's an intangible sort of a proposition, but there is nothing intangible about the way its expenditures keep growing. A few years back it was spending a comparatively lesser amount of money but this year the total is up to \$371,000.

Now it's very true to say that we get a large proportion of this back so far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned from the Federal Government and from the municipalities but we're all taxpayers in those spheres as well as provincial ones and I just wonder, and I definitely do wonder if the taxpayer is getting value for the amount of money that is spent not only by the province but by the other agencies as well. I'd be interested to know from the Honourable the Minister if he has the figures for what Metro is expending in addition to this and then what other municipalities are spending in addition to this in the Province of Manitoba, so that we have the whole figure.

As an example of how it is growing, I just checked up and the first year that this government was in office they spent just over \$123,000. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who I believe was the Minister at that time, may be having some anxious moments himself, and I'm wondering just exactly what we will be getting - or what we're likely to get out of this expenditure. I think that it's been looked at with a pretty critical view ever since and yet the expenditure that we pass here is two and a half times what it was back in those days, and when we add to that the expenditures that the municipalities and Metro are making, I would imagine that it is a sizeable sum. Now I sympathize with the Minister in trying to give any very detailed report on the activities of this organization, but I can't

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) help but feel that it's something that we should check on pretty carefully when we see the growth that's been taking place.

MR. STEINKOPF: I might be able to give you those figures briefly. The increase in the total expenditure is \$2,708 in 1966-67 over the 1965-66 year, and that is made up of the annual staff salary increments of \$788 and the primary step of a radiation monitoring piece of equipment of \$5,000, or a total increase of \$5,788, less the reduction that takes place in this year over last year in that the municipal equipment requirement is down \$3,080, leaving a net increase of \$2,708. This is broken up as follows: the total budget is \$371,081.64 and that is the total of all of the federal, municipal, metro and provincial. The provincial organization part of that is \$195,458.64, of which the province's share is 25 percent or \$48,864.66, and the Federal Government's share, the 75 percent, is \$146,593.98. Metro Winnipeg's costs: on Metro, the total cost of the operation is \$86,808, and this is paid by Metro to the extent of \$8,680.90, or 10 percent of it; and the province, 15 percent or \$13,021.20; and the Federal Government, 75 percent or \$65,106.06. The municipalities - and those would be the municipalities outside of the Metro area - the total is \$88,815 and this is paid - the municipal, \$12,492.75; provincial, \$13,322.25; and the federal, \$63,000. The municipal total contribution, including Metro, is \$21,173, the provincial is \$75,208, and the federal is \$274,699.98. And that all adds up to the same figure, \$371,081.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is correct, is it, that this is the total expenditure so far as the province is concerned? This is the total?

MR. STEINKOPF: This is the total so far as the province, the federal and the municipal governments. The \$371,081 is the total that is spent in Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: There is nothing in addition that the various municipalities or Metro have to pay. Now how would this be arranged taking Portage la Prairie for an example. Portage la Prairie has some civil defence work going on there. Are they provided with some funds that they later on reimburse the province for or do they make their expenditures and they are reimbursed. How does this work?

MR. STEINKOPF: The Portage headquarters is part of the over-all Manitoba major plan, as is Shilo and Brandon, and this comes out of the provincial contribution. The contribution that Portage would make would be to their own little EMO organization which would be just a small amount. But we have a major station in Portage la Prairie which comes under the provincial grant which is contributed 25 percent by the province and 75 percent by the Federal Government, and this is out of that total of \$146,593 being part of the \$371,081.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if Portage la Prairie has its own organization, be it big or be it little, they do pay something on that in addition to this amount?

MR. STEINKOPF: No, that would be included in this municipal amount of \$12,492.75 and Portage's share would be in that figure, which again is part of the 371. It's not an additional amount.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, what this note says is that this is less recoveries from the Government of Canada and municipalities. Well now taking Portage la Prairie as a municipality, it would not - it would not be paying something to the province for its expenditures there would it? It undoubtedly receives help as the Honourable Minister has said, but for its own purposes beyond, its own services beyond what the province does, wouldn't it make the expenditure rather than pay something back to the government?

MR. STEINKOPF: No, they would pay something back to the government. They will be assessed of this \$12,492 - and I'm just guessing - maybe five percent of that, and it would cost Portage la Prairie about \$600 out of that \$12,492 and that would be part of the \$295,000 shown in here as a rebate.

MR. CAMPBELL: So we have it established, Mr. Chairman, that this is the total amount then of all the civil defence or emergency measures expenditures in the Province of Manitoba. Could the Minister give us the up-to-date figure as to what - not what the estimate was for this year because we have it on the other side of the page - but what it is expected will be spent in total in this year that we are just now completing.

MR. STEINKOPF: The estimate for last year was \$370,551 and I believe that this was revised to \$467,000, and the reason for the increase was for the creation of two new offices, one in Portage and one in Brandon.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well the estimates that we have before us give the estimate of last year as \$366,351. I would think that would be the total estimate, and what I was wanting to get was to find out from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, how much of that \$365,351 has been spent,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) as nearly as they can estimate it at this time.

MR. STEINKOPF: I think it will all be spent and there will be an additional expenditure of 75 percent by the Federal Government and 25 percent for the Provincial Government for the building of two new EMO offices, one in Portage and one in Brandon.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would have thought in that case, Mr. Chairman, that those amounts would have been added to the \$366,355, or else we would have had the amount included in the Supplementary Estimates that we passed just this afternoon. However, if the Minister would check that, why that would be all right with me.

MR. STEINKOPF: I may be out on that because these requests just came in recently in February and they may be not included before this was printed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in general terms on the question of emergency measures and the organization of these. In the early part of March we had an emergency as a result of the sudden storm that occurred here in the Winnipeg area and there appears to have been some confusion at that time as to who was responsible for what, and there appeared to be a lack of central direction in the operation of the emergency at that time.

I have here a copy of the Winnipeg Tribune dated Saturday, 5th of March, 1966, and here for example is what one of the radio announcers had to say. Now I think the radio stations at the time of the particular emergency served a very useful purpose and did a marvelous job for the province in the area that was affected by the storm in keeping everyone notified, but this is what one of the announcers is quoted as saying. He said, "There is no central emergency source. Metro, the police, the fire department, emergency measures operation, and Civil Defence, all have a hand in a situation like this. We have to call 19 different people to find out what's happening and everybody calls up. I don't know what would happen if a bomb fell."

Now there is a statement by an individual who was very directly involved on that particular day. Surely this points out, if the statement is correct, and I would assume that because of his particular involvement, the fact that he was there at the radio station receiving the calls, he must have been very closely associated with the thing and knew what was happening. It seems to me that we should establish in a very clear way what the chain of command is, that if an emergency like that particular one, that storm, and I think it's fair to say that we were extremely fortunate that the storm did not last as long as the forecast - the forecast had been that it would continue into the Saturday and we were most fortunate that it ceased and that Saturday was clear - but surely there should be a very clear chain of command when something like this happens, that some one individual is in charge and can then co-ordinate the activities of all the various bodies involved.

To have a situation like the one that's rated here where everyone apparently has a separate responsibility and there has to be many calls in different sources, is not a good situation for the province. The particular storm was just one event. There could be any number of such events. We're not an area that is plagued with earthquakes fortunately, but they have happened elsewhere. There have been tornadoes; there could be any number of emergencies arise. Surely there should be set down, for an event of this sort, a very clear and definite chain of command, who should take the responsibility; who should make the decisions. In the event that that individual is not available, then who else down the line makes the decision.

Now the Minister will probably reply to me that this is laid down. Well then, if it is laid down, if there is such a chain of command, why wasn't it operative on that particular date? What is it that happened? It seemed to me at that time that the City of Winnipeg was the one that appeared to take the lead in the operation and it seems to me that we can't depend on just one municipality to do this. It's unfair first of all to the municipality if it has to shoulder the responsibility. It has no direct responsibility to the others and it could end up in a very uncoordinated program. So I would like to know from the Minister exactly what the situation is and was this correct? Is the statement I read correct and what steps are we taking to make sure that it doesn't happen in the future?

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, there must first of all be a clear demarcation between a civil disaster and one of a military or war emergency of some kind. The blizzard was a civil disaster and fortunately, as the honourable member said, it didn't continue to the point where a state of emergency had to be declared and therefore the onus was on the municipality to look after whatever things had to be looked after, and the major one of course was keeping the arteries and the roads open and this was their responsibility. The chain of command was

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) early set up at the Winnipeg City Hall by the Mayor at the Emergency Headquarters. The Provincial Government and EMO were at first given watching briefs, as it were, to see what was required.

All of the important aspects of municipal workings were represented at the headquarters. A news media desk was provided and radio, newspapers, television, all were represented and were there on a full-time basis. All press and news releases were made at the same time. The despatch of information was very efficient and was given to all of the news media at the same time. They set up at the City Hall in a fashion to get it. There was, I would think, no confusion at headquarters at all. I read a couple of letters this afternoon indicating how well the EMO worked with the Police and the Fire, and the Fire indirectly with the hospitals; how this worked very closely; how the Army in turn was a great help to all municipalities that required them. When it became evident around 4 or 5 o'clock when the snow had stopped that this was the worst part of it, we just continued in the same manner but had the complete EMO organization alerted for any further action that was required. The Metro EMO organization played a part in this operation and their responsibility in this case was to the Chairman who was the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

In case of a flood or any emergency of that type, there is a plan already laid out by EMO and that plan would go into operation showing the exact chain of command and people would know exactly what their job was, where it was, and when it was. If there is a war disaster, if we had a nuclear attack of any kind, not only is the plan laid out but transcripts have already been made for radio and TV and they are on the shelves of the radio and TV stations to tell the public exactly how to act and what to do and who is in charge. In addition to that the government too, as you know, has got a plan of action and almost everyone - everyone in this room will be told what his function would be in case of a wartime disaster.

I also would like to take this opportunity of criticizing some of the news releases that are going on now in connection with the flood. There is a very definite chain of command but this does not stop any reporter from assessing the situation in his own way and reporting the way that he or she sees fit. This is the freedom of the press and this is of course nothing that we can overcome. Now there has been - and there always will be I guess - in the civil disasters, particularly when they're not right upon us, a certain amount of confusion, but I can assure the honourable member there isn't any confusion at the top. The direction and the work of those that are involved is pretty clear and they know - everyone knows what their job is and what they're supposed to be doing.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what is it that happened on that particular day? Was it the fact that the government decided that it was not an emergency that there was no central control? The Minister says that in the case of a war or a disaster of that sort that there is a plan, and presumably in case of flood that there is a plan.

Now is there a plan for a very sudden and unforeseen event like that particular storm. It could be on another occasion something else, but here it seems to me was the case where there was, certainly on that morning, a case of emergency when we reached the point in a city like this one where the transit system stops functioning; where the streets are no longer open; where you cannot service areas for either fire or police; then to me it's a state of emergency. It seems to me, and judging from this statement that I read, there was no one central plan laid on. Who was actually in charge? The Mayor of Winnipeg certainly within his own sphere is in a position to operate, but the Mayor of Winnipeg isn't in a position to make decisions for St. James or St. Boniface or Fort Garry and the other suburbs.

Now surely at some state somebody has to make a general decision, and it appears that that day that wasn't established. What would be - let's assume we had that sort of storm tomorrow - who takes charge?

MR. STEINKOPF: We have a peculiar situation in the Metro area and the situation would be rather simple for EMO if there was a state of emergency declared, and that would be that the Metro EMO organization would take charge and would be in control. That would be the first stage of the emergency. Now you will recall that at 7:30 on the morning of the blizzard, it wasn't certain whether it was a blizzard. The traffic was still moving and the buses were still operating - I think they operated until about 11:00 in the morning - and there were local situations.

Many times there can be local problems and these are looked after by the chief municipal administrative officer, the mayor or the reeve. In this case the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg set up his own emergency organization and called in all of the utilities and the Department of

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) Health in his organization and set up his headquarters and took charge, but called in the Provincial Government and EMO and the Metro EMO organization. Metro EMO in turn got in touch with all of the Metro municipalities and cities other than the City of Winnipeg and they were asked to be represented at the emergency headquarters. Many of them preferred to do it alone and they did do it alone, but with the understanding that if they needed any help from EMO that it would be available and who to get in touch with. There wasn't a mayor or a reeve in the Metro Winnipeg area who didn't know where he could get facilities and how quickly, and was given a private telephone number which he could call if he needed help. The army vehicles that were used extensively all over the Metro area on that day to clear the way for the fire brigades and for emergency calls to hospitals were available for every municipality and I believe used by pretty near all of them.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I gather then from the Minister that fortunately the Mayor of Winnipeg took charge of the situation early on that Friday morning, because what he's told me now is that the Mayor of Winnipeg called his people in, and then he called the provincial people in presumably. So the leadership was given by the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg. Apparently there was none by the Province of Manitoba as such.

MR. STEINKOPF: The first part of this is correct, but at the same time the Mayor called in his people, we called in our EMO people to be ready for any emergency. So we were ready to act and when the time came for us to act a couple of hours later, our whole organization was ready to act, but there was no need for two organizations operating. Right here in this present flood crisis, EMO is not directing the flood attack as you know, it is just a co-ordinator. It is having its organization ready in case there is a flood, but there is one thing getting ready for the flood and another thing, the disaster itself.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't want to pursue the thing any further, Mr. Chairman, except to say that the Minister says that right now, because of the flood, EMO is a co-ordinator. They are getting ready and co-ordinating. That's fine because the emergency isn't here, but on that morning, I think Friday, March 4, the emergency was there then. It wasn't a question of waiting and I recommend that there be a structure that could get to work immediately and decisions could be made immediately. To say that we are waiting for one of the cities to make a decision and then we'll get into action, I think is working it in reverse if there is an emergency. With the structures that are established, and they are established for that purpose, to deal with emergencies, then the information should be focusing in to the Provincial Government surely where you're dealing with a wider area and the decision should be made by the Provincial Government.

MR. STEINKOPF: I believe that the facts of the matter is that the blizzard was handled well, efficiently, and thank goodness without any loss of life or any serious accident, and it was only done by the quick work of EMO in being ready to co-operate with the municipalities if, as and when they were required. It's not up to EMO - I don't want to get into the act and everything - to declare a state of emergency on its own and therefore they are not in a position to do it nor is its position - I suppose the Province of Manitoba could or the Federal Government could - but in the case of the blizzard it was a matter of timing, and at the same time that the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg set up his organization, we got together our people for EMO and were ready to act and then we worked together and we thought in that case it was an emergency; we had to make some quick decisions, and the best decision was to go along with one organization, one emergency headquarters rather than 13 or 14 of them, and to give out this clear crisp kind of information that we did give.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I agree that it's not up to EMO to declare a state of emergency, it's up to the Manitoba Government and that's where the decision should be made and where the leadership should come from.

I would like to ask the Minister if he could tell me if there are any plans for payment, or have there been any payments made or will there be any payments made to people who supplied equipment on that particular day. I think there were a number of cases where private individuals and firms supplied snow equipment of various types - snow-cruisers, bombardiers and so on. Is there a plan where they will be repaid for their out-of-pocket expenditures.

MR. STEINKOPF: I believe it was left that the municipalities -- they had a joint meeting where they were going to set their costs and decide what action they were going to take or whether they were going to approach the government for any assistance or not. So far, to the best of my knowledge, they have not as yet approached the government for any assistance and I believe when they do and when we see it, the government will then decide what they are in a position to do.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr Chairman, this is for the municipalities, but what of a firm or private individual? Quite a number of them worked all of that day and well into the night, particularly those who were supplying emergency transportation, things like the snow-cruisers and the bombardiers, and in some cases heavy equipment, front-end loaders and so on. What are these people to do?

MR. STEINKOPF: I think it was very clear that day that there was two departments - one of volunteers, and there were many snow-cruisers and auto-toboggans that were volunteered, and volunteers of course are not requesting any pay. Anything that was ordered that day will of course be billed to the municipality in which the service was provided or the equipment loaned, and then the municipality will total up their costs just as they are their snow-clearing costs, and then I presume will pass on a recommendation to the government. But any commitments that were made to pay for equipment or manpower will certainly be honoured by either the municipality or the organization that commandeered it, and the same thing - any bills that EMO took upon itself will be part of the EMO cost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the blizzard on that Friday was very well handled by the municipalities involved, and if there is co-ordinating work to be done, I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has made a case for one consolidated city in Metropolitan Winnipeg so that there would be a proper co-ordinated job.

I want to apologize to the Minister for having been called out at the time that he answered my questions dealing with consumer protection - credit I should say, and I was told that he said that the legislative aspect had a very low priority but that he did mention some legislation as coming forth. -- (Interjection) -- Are we not on the salary still?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Emergency Measures.

MR. CHERNIACK: Okay, I'll find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 93 -- passed; Resolution 94 --

MR. MOLGAT: I believe 94 is the Centennial Corporation. I wonder if the Minister could give us some information now as to the progress on the Arts Centre, particularly from a cost standpoint. Apparently, in other areas there have been some very substantial increases in costs in the proposed projects. Could he tell us at this time what are the likely estimates as final costs for the Arts Centre.

MR. STEINKOPF: The Centennial project of the Arts Centre is the Concert Hall and it was originally estimated to cost in the neighbourhood of \$6 million. The tender came in at \$6,900,000, about \$900,000 more than the estimate. The cost of the land has been pretty well set and it's well within the budget figures.

The invitations to tender on the Planetarium are out now and are due within a couple of weeks, and we will know whether this part of it will cost more than what we estimated. The estimate has been revised of course because of the inflationary trends in the construction business. The plans will be continued for the museum and probably won't be ready for quite some time, but these aren't scheduled until 1970 so that there is no other indication of what the costs will be. But the only definite cost - the only cost that we have so far is the cost of the Concert Hall, which came in at about \$6,900,000.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister tell us what was the original estimated cost of the whole complex there and what is the estimated total cost at the moment for the whole thing.

MR. STEINKOPF: I haven't got an estimated cost of the total complex, but the original cost estimate of the first phase of it was \$11 million. You will recall that that was to be raised by Federal-Provincial-Municipal and public subscription, and that estimate must now be probably revised upwards, to the extent that the Concert Hall has cost an extra million dollars, and any increase that the Planetarium may be which we will know in the next few weeks.

MR. MOLGAT: At the moment then, we are roughly \$1 million up from the original planned cost. The original planned cost would be \$11 million and we can now expect twelve. Could the Minister indicate when the Concert Hall and the Planetarium will be ready?

MR. STEINKOPF: The Concert Hall is scheduled for the fall of 1967 and the Planetarium a little earlier or late summer of 1967. These have been the estimates of time that were given last year. We are still hoping that we can make that schedule. I am happy to advise that we are the farthest advanced of any of the provinces that are building Centennial projects. I was in Ottawa earlier this week and saw the hole in the ground for their mammoth Centennial centre similar to ours, at a cost of now well over \$30 million, and they have no chance at all of getting it through in 1967; it is now scheduled for late 1968.

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.)

But these are part of the problems that all areas have to contend with because they're all beyond the control of the Centennial Committees or the people that are building them. It's just a situation that there's very little that one can do anything about. There is a shortage of labour, the shortage of material, and there's a longer time required to build these big buildings. They're very technical and they take a particular type of artisan to build. Our schedule is still, as I say for the Concert Hall, the fall of 1967 and with any kind of luck we'll reach that date. If not, it won't be long after that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that in Regina the Centennial projects - the estimated costs have nearly doubled. Can he explain or indicate why he expects the Centennial projects for Manitoba only to jump up - what - something like 10 percent?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well this is the kind of question I like to answer. Saskatchewan decided to take the \$2½ million that they received from the Federal Government and to match it and to build two concert halls, one in the City of Regina and the other in the City of Saskatoon. Saskatoon had been saving its money, its tax discount on their electric lights and telephone bills over a period of time and had an extra million dollars, and the Saskatchewan Government matched the \$2½ million so that they had a total pool of about \$6 million. They then went to work and planned their concert hall in both of these cities and went so far in Regina as to dig the foundation and put some steel up. The architects were a little late in getting their plans out, and just within the last two or three weeks I believe, the tenders came in and the Minister, Wilf Gardiner in Regina called, and was quite surprised to find that the tender in Regina - I think he said came in at \$9, 200, 000 and the one in Saskatoon at \$7, 200, 000 for a total of \$16, 400, 000 for these two concert halls with a budget of around \$6 million.

Now these costs are firm tenders. Why they came about I don't know, but we have a firm tender on the Concert Hall at \$6, 900, 000 and there it is - and it's going ahead. I can't explain why theirs should go so much beyond their estimates unless their plans were much more elaborate than what they wanted, or maybe the architects made an error in telling them that they could build for the original amount that they thought they could build for.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, is the proposed new Courthouse to be constructed in the Arts Centre area, and if so, where is it going to be built?

MR. STEINKOPF: It's planned to build it in the area, but a definite decision on its location has not yet been made.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the same architects who designed the Concert Hall be designing the new Courthouse?

MR. STEINKOPF: No. They are another firm of architects that have already completed, I think, the preliminary sketches on this new Concert Hall, and they're not one of the three that are presently on the Concert Hall.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When is the construction expected to begin on the new Courthouse?

MR. STEINKOPF: I don't know but I would think fairly soon, but this is a matter for the Attorney-General's Department and not mine.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will there be other accommodation in the facilities in the new Courthouse other than the building of the Courthouse itself?

MR. STEINKOPF: I can't answer that. I haven't seen the plans for the Courthouse.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at the last Session I asked the Minister if there would be adequate set-backs for the Arts Centre and there is a model on display now which would indicate that there aren't these set-backs, but as I understood the Minister last year, he said there would be set-backs. You know the building would be set back properly from the street line. I think the Concert Hall is one of them, but the other buildings are not set back. Is this not correct?

MR. STEINKOPF: I think the question was whether the Concert Hall would be set back and I think the figure is somewhere between 100 and 120 feet from Main Street. There is even a driveway off of Main Street between Main Street and the front entrance of the Concert Hall. I think that the architects decided that the Science Research Building would look better if it was closer to Main Street. It would be a better balance, a better aesthetic balance to the project if that building was closer to Main Street than what the Concert Hall is, and the Planetarium is also a little closer to Main Street even though it's going to be set back from the Concert Hall.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When the Minister replied last year, have the plans changed since that time then? As I understood the Minister last year, these buildings would be set back and now he indicates that they've decided not to.

MR. STEINKOPF: There's been no change in the plans of the Concert Hall. It's still back 120 feet. The plans for the others last year weren't even remotely close to being finished. We didn't even have a definite decision as to what we were going to build, and the rough sketches of the Planetarium, the museum and the Science Research Building have been changed a half a dozen times since last year. They are now frozen.

MR. GUTTORMSON: With regard to the -- last Session I directed some questions regarding the roadways in respect to urban renewal and so on. What are the plans with regard to the roadways in this particular area?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well the only thing that has actually happened has been the relocation of the outlet of the Disraeli Freeway. That has been determined and the land has been procured for that, and another department has done that with Metro. Since last year, an urban renewal plan has been approved - not a plan but a project has been approved by the same agency, the City of Winnipeg and the Provincial Government, and consultants and architects have been appointed for an urban renewal scheme for the whole area east of Main Street from Notre Dame to Higgins Avenue on the North, and that plan will be ready in a few months and that will include all of the new arterial highways, roads and bridges and everything that will be part of the urban renewal scheme.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Has land been expropriated in the area since we discussed this at the last Session?

MR. STEINKOPF: Not any more than was -- I don't know exactly when it was but we were just in the middle of expropriating land at the last Session. Other than the land for the Disraeli Freeway, I believe this has been expropriated by Metro.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Have parking facilities been a matter for consideration -- parking facilities in this particular area and where will they be located?

MR. STEINKOPF: Parking will be provided under the Museum Building and we are now negotiating with the City of Winnipeg to build a tunnel under Main Street to connect with the new parking building behind the City Hall. There now is a tunnel from the parking area right through to the basement of the City Hall Building and it is hoped to continue that right through to the Concert Hall.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Has the government purchased the Playhouse Theatre, and if not, do they plan to purchase it?

MR. STEINKOPF: The government hasn't purchased the Playhouse Theatre. It has no plans for the Playhouse Theatre now. It's owned by the City of Winnipeg, as you know, and the City of Winnipeg have told us that they will co-operate in our plans for the centre, but it's still owned by the Playhouse and no effort or any action has been taken in that connection.

MR. GUTTORMSON: At the last Session the Minister indicated that he had owned some property in the same general area that had not been expropriated. Does that land still belong to him or has it been expropriated since that time?

MR. STEINKOPF: There's been no change in that situation at all.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Then it's still yours - that's the land kitty-corner from the present Police Station.

MR. STEINKOPF: It belongs to a company that the family owns, it's not mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 95 -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister indicate (Recording failure) is that the Province of Manitoba, is it Metro, or is it on a sharing basis, and is this assessed to the Arts Centre or what is the set-up?

MR. STEINKOPF: I believe that this is a normal operation of the Metro government, and in the arrangement that's made between Metro and the province on arterial highways, or main highways, this is shared and I think maybe the Minister of Highways could answer that better than I can. If I'm correct, it's on a 50-50 basis, but this isn't done just because of the Arts Centre. The Disraeli Freeway was only a temporary route down James Street before, and ultimately this was the final and hopeful route of the whole Disraeli complex.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, is the government playing a part in the role to collect money from subscriptions for the Arts Centre? I mean is there a drive going on to try and raise money by subscription, and if so, how long will this last and how much is expected to be raised?

MR. STEINKOPF: I'm very happy that I can bring this matter before the House because we're looking for a very successful citizens' campaign. There is a citizens' campaign now in progress under the co-chairmanship of Mr. George Heffelfinger, Mr. George Sellers and Mr.

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) Sam Cohen. The campaign has been started and it is hoped that the campaign by September 1 will raise the best part of \$4½ million, and this is going to mean a lot of help from all of us in order to do it. These funds will be used not only for the Arts Centre, but for the Art Gallery and for the Manitoba Theatre Centre.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Would the government still be interested in having the Art Gallery located in the Arts Centre area despite the fact that their plans for locating in another area are nearly completed, or will they let it remain the way it is now?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well the government really has no say in the question of where the Winnipeg Art Gallery is going to locate. Originally, it was hoped that it would be in this area because those of the government who were interested thought that it would be a better Centre if all of these facilities were there in one place and many operating costs would be lessened if they were. However, there are others who didn't agree and they decided on another location and I think that they plan to build an Art Gallery in the neighbourhood across the street from the Hudson Bay Company Store on Portage Avenue.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the government be making a grant to them despite the fact that they are not locating in the Arts Centre area?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, they will be.

MR. GUTTORMSON: How much percentage will be paid, or how is the basis of the grant?

MR. STEINKOPF: At the time that the Winnipeg Art Gallery were offered a location in the cultural centre, they were told that if they decided not to go into the Centre they would receive the same share that the Manitoba Government would have paid if they would have gone in to the Arts Centre, and at that time the cost was estimated to be around \$2,200,000, so the government is obligated now to contribute the sum of \$750,000 more or less to the building of a Winnipeg Art Gallery.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's been brought to my attention that unless the Art Gallery gets 90 percent of the cost from the provincial and federal governments, that they may not proceed. Has the Minister any indication whether this is a fact or not?

MR. STEINKOPF: No, this is not a fact.

MR. GUTTORMSON: go ahead with the grant that you are going to give them?

MR. STEINKOPF: They can go ahead with the grant but I don't think the grant would be paid if they can't finish their -- they'll have to show evidence that they can pay for the building.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, but my question was: Is there any indication that they may not even get the building off the ground if they're not assured of 95 percent of the cost? That's the question I'm asking.

MR. STEINKOPF: I don't know. I haven't heard that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that, insofar as parking, the plan was to consider a tunnel from the Arts Centre site under Main Street over to the parkade. I presume this is a change from the original plans because I thought that there was going to be underground parking from the plans he showed us last year at the site itself. Now if there's a plan for a tunnel under Main Street, what consideration has there been given here working with Metro. It seems to me that in this whole operation there have been a number of complaints from Metro that they were not consulted in the whole planning of the Arts Centre, that the government made a unilateral decision to place the Arts Centre there without consultation with Metro and that as a result there have been a number of difficulties with streets, for example the Disraeli Freeway, the bridge from St. Boniface, and that in the whole planning Metro was ignored. Now the government says that they are planning a tunnel. It seems to me that Metro were considering some time ago, in long range plans admittedly, the possibility of a subway in Winnipeg and that subway would logically run under Main Street and presumably under Portage Avenue. The government is now planning a tunnel. What relationship will this have with any future plans for a possible subway in the area?

MR. STEINKOPF: Well that's a very interesting prospect, but I think if the subway went down Main Street it would be very awkward for our tunnel. One would have to come down the tunnel, get up over the subway and go down around the other side, but maybe there's some way we could get across the tracks without having to go up.

I'm not too sure that the statement that Metro had not been consulted is a fairly accurate one. We have produced evidence over the years that Metro had been consulted, but there appears to be at least one individual on the Metro Council who keeps flogging this dead horse that

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) we didn't consult Metro, although lately we haven't heard too much about it. We have worked very very closely with Metro in all parts of this project, not only in building it, but the architects I think are almost daily in consultation with the Metro officials on roads and on services and matters that they just simply have to work with Metro or nothing could have been accomplished and we wouldn't have been as far as we are now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says now they are consulting Metro. My question was: Did they consult with Metro originally? When the government made the decision to go into that area, was there consultation with Metro at that time, was there planning with Metro, because after all this government gave Metro the responsibility for planning - no one else, this government did. The question is, did they, prior to making the decision to go into that location, did they then consult with Metro - was the planning for this done in consultation with Metro?

MR. STEINKOPF: The government made this decision to buy a piece of land without asking Metro whether they could or they couldn't, but before they decided to do anything with that piece of land or before they made any plans for that piece of land, they talked to Metro officials at all levels.

MR. MOLGAT: But did the government buy the piece of land without having any plans as to what they would do with it?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes. They knew what they wanted to do, but without the plans. Plans are quite an elaborate thing. You can buy a piece of land; you don't have to have the plan. You know you want to build a house on it but you haven't got the plans for the house at the time you buy the land.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, in the Arts Centre area where the land was expropriated, have all the owners been settled? I mean have they received their money, or is there some likelihood of it going to the courts for arbitration?

MR. STEINKOPF: They all haven't received their money and there will be a likelihood that some will go to court although this isn't in my department, and again would defer to the department who is looking after the expropriation proceedings.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say that anyone who was going to build a house would buy the land and then make plans later? I have here a newspaper article from the Free Press, January 31, 1966, and before I quote out of the article, I understood the Minister to make reference to some Metro Councillor who was flogging a dead horse - was this the words? I have here this article and I would like to quote out of it and it's quoting one of the Metro Councillors. The headline is, "Metro Sabotaged by Government, Councillor Coulter tells Planners. 'Metro was stripped of any possible prestige by a single act of the Provincial Government, a unilateral decision to put the cultural centre on Main Street, ' Metro Councillor Art Coulter charged.' Then further down in the article he says this, "Bluntly put', Councillor Coulter said 'the Provincial Government pulled the rug out from under the planning division and left us with a host of subsequent problems to solve'. " And he goes on to say, "That sort of unilateral action," he said, "if continued, will destroy downtown Winnipeg, destroy opportunities we can't afford to lose."

Now surely, Mr. Chairman, when the government enters into a project at the magnitude that we are talking about on the Arts Centre in the neighbourhood of \$11 million and they start out and they buy a piece of land and then they decide about plans; then after that comes the problem of parking, street traffic, the re-routing and relocating of underground wiring, underground duct-work and plumbing and so on; does the Minister mean to tell us that he did not consult these people at this time.

Surely if what Councillor Coulter says here is true, and it appears to be quite true, surely the Minister and the people that he worked with are sadly at fault here. They neglected to take into consideration the plans and the aspirations of Metro Council and surely this should be answered. What the Minister has said, in effect, was that he and his group have bought the piece of land and then they decided what they were going to do with it. For instance, since this land has been purchased, it's common knowledge in financial circles in Winnipeg that land values have skyrocketed in the area, and now Metro and the City of Winnipeg have to adjust their planning and they have to adjust on the basis of the higher prices for everything in the area. Surely what the Minister says in this regard is not a satisfactory answer.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether to answer that kind of question or not. I just don't understand what the question is, but there seems to be quite an inconsistency in the questions and the conclusions that are arrived at. One of the purposes of buying the land

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) was to stimulate some interest in the area and to create some urban renewal. Now lands wouldn't skyrocket unless somebody had a use for those lands, and there are all kinds of buildings being contemplated in the area which will revive the area - and I need only refer to one major one that will probably cost more than any building in the history of Manitoba, and that's the one that's going up on the corner of Portage and Main - and all of this, because of the decision to build the City Hall in that area and the Arts Centre in that area. This is exactly the kind of urban renewal that was anticipated, and the stimulant that was required is that which can only be taken by a government body of one type or another.

It's common practice for most of us here in Winnipeg to find a suitable location to build a home and to buy the piece of property and to sit on it for four or five years and then start planning to build your house on the property. You don't go and make a plan for a house and then find a piece of property that will suit the kind of house that you are going to buy. Mr. Coulter is entitled to his opinion. He has stated it rather firmly. I don't know why he did. It was the first time he did it. I'm not going to argue with him, but we have sufficient evidence here which was produced in writing at estimate time last year and the year before, that there has been consultation at all times with the Metro people on everything. We have never had any complaint from Metro as such, other than a statement such as the one that you read and that isn't too detailed, it's just a generalization that anyone who wants to be a critic could make.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister to say in effect that he's spending \$11 million of the Manitoba taxpayers' money to upgrade one particular section of one city in Manitoba.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, this could go on forever. If you understood me to say that why you said it not me. Hansard will record what I said. You may read into it anything you want but the innuendoes will not, in any way, affect the decision that's made. I think that you, as well as everyone in this House, will be very proud of the manner in which this whole project was handled; the economic way the people are handling it; our great large body of volunteers who would, I think, not be happy with the kind of suggestions that you are making, because they have done this on the best possible business basis that they know how, and in a way that will only bring credit to the Centennial buildings. You heard a few minutes ago what's happening in other localities, and in some of these localities they've got buildings that are half up that can't be completed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I regret the Minister had to use the word "innuendo", but did he not say that one of the primary reasons for putting the Arts Centre where it is now going to be located was for the -- one of the reasons was to upgrade the area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 94 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the matter, I don't know what the Minister is referring to when he speaks of innuendo. What I'm concerned about is how this matter was handled insofar as Metro. That was the purpose of my questioning on this particular aspect.

The Minister then, I take it from his statement, tells us that all the way through there was complete co-ordination and planning with Metro on this affair and that the planning department of Metro was consulted all the way through insofar as the development of this project. I take it that that is his statement. It doesn't agree with the statement that I have heard from Metro people. If that's the Minister's statement then I would await further comments from Metro itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 94 -- passed; Resolution 95 -- passed; Department of Welfare.

..... continued on next page

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to make a very few comments on some of the changes that occur in Welfare Estimates this year which I think the Committee may be interested in. To begin with the year 1966-67 will go down as somewhat of a banner year for this is the year in which we proclaim the balance of The Social Allowances Act, with one very minor exception - a minor one but an important one that I will comment on in a few minutes. I would like to say that the philosophy which was accepted when this Act was introduced into the House in 1959 and which was approved unanimously by all members of the House, has now been accepted by the Government of Canada and is proposed for the new Canada Assistance Plan, and has been accepted in principle by all of the other governments of Canada and will likely be implemented in legislation by them within the next 12 months.

During this year we hope then to have lifted the burden of financial responsibility from the municipalities of the province with respect to all of those long-term cases that provide also the greatest financial burden to them. The sections of the Act that will be proclaimed this year are all of those desertions over one year; the unmarried mothers with two or more children; and families where the husband is in jail for one or more years. The only portion of the Act that remains then unproclaimed is that section that deals with -- or that reference that is made to Indians as defined under The Indian Act. As I said this is a very small reference but a very important one, and particularly so to the Indian people and in terms of human need in our province.

Now the reasons why this is not being proclaimed is first of all, it is a Federal responsibility and has been for a great many years; secondly we asked whether the province had the staff to do an adequate job of serving these people, spread out as they are throughout the length and breadth of the province, and to a large extent in the more remote and more isolated settlements with which we as a department have very little contact at the present time, and which Indian Affairs have fairly close contact.

But I think more important than any of these considerations is the question as to whether the Indian, at this stage, wants the Provincial Welfare service. I think it's safe to say that the Indians are very suspicious of attempts by various governments to bargain away their rights. Rights established either by treaty or by tradition. I think they have seen over the years a number of encroachments by the white society which have on some occasions tended to encroach upon some of these rights that they consider to be sacred, and which they, of course, have reason to be suspicious of when governments talk about giving up certain services to other jurisdictions.

I understand discussions are presently under way at the Federal level, with the various Indian Advisory Committees. There have been some preliminary discussions with the provinces and I understand that all of these discussions are to continue in the future. In the meantime, we feel that there are many positive and very constructive things that we as a provincial government can do to help to assist Indians to attain a better life.

In these estimates we have a very substantial expansion in our Community Development Program which we believe will assist in helping these people. We propose to help in two ways: one is to help through community development to help local people to make better utilization of those resources that they have available to them at the present time; and secondly to assist those who want to seek employment opportunities elsewhere to take advantage of these opportunities.

There has been, over the last few years, a very considerable improvement in the use of local resources by Indian and Metis people. There have been a very great many economic projects established which have had a great deal of value to local communities and to individuals. I'm thinking of projects such as pulp cutting, fish processing, wild rice harvesting; various agricultural operations and projects, commercial development of one kind or another. And as important as all of these economically are in terms of value to the community, I think more important is the sense of achievement that is left with the local people; the sense of accomplishment and the confidence that they can do things for themselves given reasonable encouragement and reasonable opportunities, and it is developing local leadership to the extent that it hasn't been developed for a good many years. I think too, that community development, because it is a process that encourages people to look pretty realistically at the opportunities in their area, and does help them to take advantage of whatever there may be to improve their conditions; it does help them to then face the facts about communities in many cases and to recognize the very limited opportunities that there are in many of our remote and isolated underdeveloped

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . .

communities, and for many of these people they are taking advantage of opportunities for educational upgrading, for vocational training, and seeking opportunities to leave the community for employment outside. For those who decide to move out we do hope to be able to assist them with a very substantially beefed-up program of job placement and job assistance. These include such things as orientation, guidance, counselling, referral to training, actual placement in employment and most important, we think is the follow-up procedure that helps him to accommodate to a new environment and particularly his family.

I think we all recognize some of the very great difficulties that face people who come from a remote settlement moving into a place of employment possibly in an urban environment. It's really a terrifying experience to face some of the problems that they must face in an urban area. We had occasion a few months ago to bring some 17 men from Duck Bay, which is not one of our more remote settlements, in fact it's a community that's had fairly close contact with white communities and white settlers in the area, and yet we found that in moving those people into the city we have great problems for them to overcome. Problems in money management to begin with. Problems of coping with metropolitan transit; most of them had never seen a street car or at least a metro transit bus before. They had no idea of how to purchase tickets, how to transfer from one bus to the other, and all of these sorts of things. None of them had been in -- at least very few of them had been in steady and regular employment before and there were many experiences that they faced for the first time and had very great difficulties in overcoming and could only overcome with the close working of an officer of our department who is engaged for that purpose.

I think when a family moves into the city we have even greater problems for people to face because very many of them haven't lived in areas that have all of the modern facilities. I know I visited a family not long ago who had been at Ninette for some time. They'd had a course there which seemed to put them more closely in touch with urban living and yet one of the facts that our worker found was that the lady was terrified of the electric range, she'd never been instructed in how to use it. This can be quite a frightening experience, particularly if you have had the youngster bite through one of the electric cords and things of that kind. So these are just some of the little problems to us because we've lived with electricity all our lives, but it becomes a real problem for families who have had no experience with this kind of life.

Our new program will locate staff in several communities in the province - Thompson, The Pas, The Interlake area, Brandon and in Winnipeg. They will be providing relocation - at least included in these estimates will be an amount for relocation expenses and grants may be provided for such things as travelling expense, the moving of families into areas of employment, allowances for tools, some assistance with accommodation, clothing possibly, and things of that kind.

We don't propose to use this money without taking advantage of all other services or agencies or funds that may be available for this purpose so we will be working very closely with the National Employment Service, the new Manpower Agency that's been established by Ottawa and we'll be using to the extent possible existing agencies. I think that this program is coming in at a time when we can be optimistic about the future and we hope that it will be able to assist many Manitobans of Indian origin and others to make maximum use of the employment opportunities that are developing throughout the province both in the north and in the south as well.

These are the two major changes included in these estimates. There is one other that's less obvious because the amount remains the same, the votes, the appropriation remains the same but by virtue of the change in the Elderly and Infirm Persons Housing Act that got third reading yesterday and it will mean a great deal more in terms of what it will buy in terms of new elderly and infirm persons housing accommodation. So these Mr. Chairman, are the main changes in our estimates. If there are any other questions, I'll be very pleased to try to answer.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to thank my honourable friend for the very brief comment that he made in introducing his Estimates to the members of the House, and as usual I want to pay tribute to all of his staff, because I guess I have said this on at least seven occasions that if there is one department in which I get a great deal of co-operation, it is from the Department of Welfare. The Social Workers in my area have been most co-operative and we are served well by them. The social worker from the Portage office

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... attends Neepawa at least one day every week and the area is served well, and I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Now, that is about the extent of the compliments that I want to pay at the moment, because it seems to me that the Minister was really too brief. I certainly hope that he has a lot of other improvements in his department that he intends to introduce to us as we proceed with his estimates. For instance, I was completely disappointed when there was no mention made at all of that section of the Throne Speech that is referred to on Page 5 - at the top of Page 5, where it says, "a measure designed to strengthen counselling services for deserted wives and children and to deal with fathers that are deserting their family responsibility will be laid before you."

Mr. Chairman, about the first week of this Session, one of the Ministers of the Cloth from Neepawa made a special visit in here to see me and to express his concern about this very subject matter that is referred to in the Throne Speech and I know that his concern is shared by every member of this House, I am sure. There is not a week goes by I guess but that someone does not walk into my office and tell me the sad story that her husband has deserted her and what does she do now. And there's no doubt that each and every member here has had this sad story told to them and I was looking forward - I was looking forward to some help in this regard; and true the Throne Speech tells us there will be a measure introduced to deal with the fathers that have deserted their wives. Well, where Mr. Chairman, is the measure that we're told about? Maybe, maybe my honourable friend still intends to introduce a bill in this respect. If he does perhaps he will enlighten us of that as we proceed with the estimates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the field of Social Welfare and Social Allowances, there is a great deal of misunderstanding and that is an understatement, because my honourable friend always likes to get up and tell us about his "needs" test and the benefits that it has over what was known as the "means" test and it is quite evident that a lot of people in the province do not comprehend the difference between the two and I'm included in that class. I yet have to try and figure out what the difference is. I am satisfied that a great deal of the difficulty in comprehending this needs test and the implications of it, stems from the fact that we have so many different plans that have a different approach to the needs of a family. Everyone in this House that heard Bill Trebilcoes' by-line, I think it was earlier this week, would know exactly what I mean by this because -- (Interjection) -- the bee-line, was it? - the bee-line or the by-line, I don't know which it was. Well, it doesn't matter anyway. But about Monday of this week this was the topic of the bee-line and actually this was about what the people were saying that phoned him up. They said well we have just received a letter from the family planning bureau, that's what they call them - The Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg, that tells us that a family of two adults and three children require \$303.70 a month, and the next day following all of this comment on the radio, I telephoned the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg and asked them if they would supply me with the material that had been used by so many people on the air, and they did. They supplied me with three copies so in case anyone is interested I have a couple of additional copies here. The Honourable Minister of Education would like one. I may be able to find it for him at the moment and if I can't find it for him now, I will see that he gets one.

Now the family of two adults and three children that the Family Bureau of Greater Winnipeg talk about do not own a car, do not own a car. Anyone in this House that owns a car knows that this can add to your expenses quite greatly. This family does not own a car and yet the family bureau says that the least they can get along on, without a car, is \$303.70. So where does that put my honourable friend with his "needs" test. Now someone is wrong.

Now, with the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons Allowances Board and here I would like to - the same kind remarks that I said about the social workers applies to the social workers for the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons Allowances Board. They are just as co-operative as the social workers or welfare workers under the Social Allowances Branch. But they have another yardstick that they use and here is the type of letter - one sentence that I quite frequently get from them because they are always courteous enough to send me a copy of what they write to the applicant and they always say this, "I wish to advise that your application for Old Age Assistance has been rejected; the reason for same being your income is in excess of that allowed under the Act for a married couple, namely, \$2,200 per annum" -- \$2,200 per annum. Now, how does that stack up with the needs test that my honourable friend uses. He uses one that's about half of this sum. He doesn't. I'm glad he said that, Mr. Chairman, because I've got a letter here to prove that he does. And now might be just a dandy time to dig it out and read it to him, if I can find it, in which the social worker went out and this

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... family were both earning - both earning? - they were both in receipt of the Old Age Pension of \$150, a month combined. Here we are. I have a wonderful filing system.

This is from the Department of Welfare --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, I haven't got an extra copy of this one, but I can get one. Thank heavens we have a photo-copy machine out here that only costs us six cents a piece to get copies made. But they have gone out, my honourable friend's workers have gone out and told this couple, because they are a couple, that their income is \$150 a month. There's no lie about that because they both get the Old Age Pension. They say, according to them, that is the Welfare Department, their needs are \$100.25 for the two of them, and therefore, they have an excess over their needs of \$50.00 per month. And they didn't demand it back, Mr. Chairman; they didn't want the \$50, of their Old Age Pension back, but what I am trying to point up is this. My honourable friend has told this couple that they only need \$100 a month for the both of them. The other letter that I just read said that \$2,200 was the figure for a married couple. --(Interjection)-- They don't? Well, does my honourable friend want copies of both of these letters? He can sure have them because these are two yardsticks and they are both a mile apart. And there's plenty of other instances.

Now, I understand that the City of Winnipeg, in which 50% of the people of this province reside handle their own welfare and administer it and the province makes a contribution towards it. So that we can't compare that I don't suppose to the remainder of the province. But I am told that they, that is the City of Winnipeg, use another yardstick in determining the needs of individuals and families quite different again to what my honourable friend uses.

Now, in the rural parts of the province where the rural municipal men administer relief-- and there certainly is a certain amount of relief that the rural municipalities and rural towns still have to budget for; quite a little bit yet -- they use another yardstick. So it is little wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the people are confused over this whole issue and the basis used in determining need. Because you get a person moving from one area to the other, and coming in contact with five or six different yardsticks it would confuse anybody.

And then of course, Mr. Chairman, there is the relief rates or qualifications that are set up by the government, I suppose, in the unorganized territories and the disorganized territories of the province. I wonder if he would, when he speaks again would he tell us what yardsticks he uses in these two different areas. It would be interesting to know how many different yardsticks, in total, that are used to assess a person's needs. --(Interjection)-- The metric system one fellow has suggested, but my honourable friend the Minister of Education is shaking his head. He doesn't think that that is quite true.

Now under the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Act - well of course it is going to go out of the picture in about another four years I believe, that is when everyone at the age of 65 qualified for Old Age Security Pension, then of course, I suppose that there will be no more need for the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Act. Well there may be for blind persons, I don't know, but certainly not for old age assistance. But under the present Old Age Assistance Act, if you qualify for Old Age Assistance -- and there are quite a number in the province who do -- then you don't have to pay your Manitoba Hospital premium. I think I am correct in that. That having qualified for Old Age Assistance you do not have to pay your hospital premium. Not so under my friend's Social Allowances. There's all kinds of people in the province who are getting less than \$2,200 per year that are still paying their premiums. All kinds of them.

I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend did say that he had extended one little section of the Social Allowances Act; that is the payment for widows or deserted wives. It used to be four years; I believe; he's now reduced it to one. He's now reduced it to one. Well that's a little bit of help. But this government, back in 1959 when they were seeking office-seeking re-election - they made a lot of promises and they said under Social Allowances, here's the statement they made seven years ago "Social Allowances was an Act to ensure that no resident of Manitoba lacks essential food, clothing and shelter or medical or dental or optical care." That's what they said seven years ago. And seven years later that the statement is not true. Seven years later the statement is not true. There are people in this province, and quite a number of them, that still have to depend on relatives or friends to keep body and soul together. And just last week, I believe, I received a letter from my honourable friend that points this up very clearly, in respect to a case at Gladstone. And incidentally, I would like him to tell me whether or not this extension in the Social Allowances Plan that he just announced, would it take care of this particular case?

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)...

Mr. Chairman, this letter from the Minister was dated March 18, 1966, and today's the 24th, and my honourable friend says that she does not qualify for Social Allowance. And all of this correspondence from this lady in Gladstone, and when I wrote to my honourable friend on March 14, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that at least he was prompt in replying, and I appreciate that because I did want a reply before we reached his estimates. So I want to thank him for that, but when I paid 12 cents to have this letter copied and I sent a copy to my honourable friend, I say that the letter clearly points up that this is a case of dire need. And it does. It does point that up, but my honourable friend wrote me on the 18th to say she does not qualify. She doesn't qualify because this part of The Social Allowances Act I guess has not been proclaimed that takes care of her. I guess that's the answer, and yet seven years ago when they were seeking re-election they said nobody in the province would suffer, and they're still suffering.

Now Val Werier of The Tribune, I think, has about the same impression that I have on a lot of the comments that I have just made, because he starts out this column, "Mr. S" - and he isn't talking about me I'm sure - "a 63-year old wrote me this week and asked, 'Do I have to pay hospitalization? I cannot keep my head above water as it is'," and he goes on and on. "The answer is that he must pay his premiums because his income at \$86.40 is considered sufficient. Neither can he qualify for Medicare, the complete coverage of all medical costs for the poor." And he goes on and on and he sets out what it costs him to live and how he accounts his expenditures not including food - not including food. Transportation, recreation, household incidentals and tobacco amount to \$58.12 a month. This is made up as follows: rent - \$35.00, electricity - \$2.40, life insurance to provide for his burial - \$5.62, telephone - \$4.10, doctor's bills - \$5.00, pills - \$4.00, hospitalization - \$2.00 -- without food -- and he didn't qualify for Social Allowances, and he cites several other examples here.

I made the statement some time ago, I guess it was when we were dealing with the Health estimates, that in my opinion it would save the province money if they would give a Medicare card to everyone that's in receipt of Social Allowances. People are not going to use them -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. CARROLL: They all get them now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They don't get them now.

MR. CARROLL: Everyone that has a Social Allowance has a Medicare card - every last one - everyone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Everyone has a medicare -- every person who gets Social Allowances has a Medicare card.

MR. CARROLL: That's right - everyone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I'm glad to know that because this was not so. This was not so. This letter that I just read to you where you took his Medicare card away from him - and I can read the whole letter too if you like. You went out and took it away from him. You know why you took it away from him? You said that he had bought his glasses now, he had bought his false teeth now, and he didn't need the Medicare card any longer and you took it back from him. That's exactly what they said in this letter.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I'm still waiting for an answer to that question that I put to my honourable friend yesterday before the Orders of the Day on dentures. He said he would take it as notice and he'd let me know today, but he hasn't let me know up to now. If I have a Medicare card or if anyone has a Medicare card and they need new dentures - this was the question - can they go to a dentist and get their dentures, and will the dentist be paid? I would like to know that because I think it's been pretty well established that you would get your dentures for less money at a dentist and then you would automatically save the taxpayers' money. Well let my honourable friend answer this one. Will they pay him or will they not pay him? Will they pay a chiropractor - I asked this yesterday - under Medicare? Will they pay an optometrist? I see my honourable friend the Minister of Labour kind of smiling to himself. I think he knows the profession of which I speak fairly well. Have they paid you my honourable friend?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): No, not me.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They won't pay you?

MR. BAIZLEY: Not me, no, but they've paid chiropractors.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They do pay?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: I told you that yesterday.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You said that there were certain provisions - other provisions. You said they couldn't be paid under Medicare but there were other ways that they could be paid. Now there's lots of -- I would like to hear incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more about the benefits of this Medicare card and who do they pay and how much do they pay. I have in my file here a letter from a lady that is not in my constituency and she wants hearing-aid glasses. She has bought hearing-aid glasses and paid big money for them - paid big money for them and they were no good to her. Now under Medicare I understand that you will authorize them to buy one hearing aid. Is there no provision to guarantee that it will work, or what do you do? There should be -- I had a lady in Neepawa that paid \$700 of hard-earned money for some of the dashed things that she had to throw away. Mr. Chairman, do you want me to stop speaking now so that the rest of us can go home?

MR. EVANS: There seems to be unanimous consent on that point, so I move the committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I 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 10:00 Friday morning.