

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 16, 1967

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed, I would draw to the attention of the Members of the Committee, on my right hand we have 24 students from the Maple Leaf School. They are under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Lebedeff. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

Also on my left hand we have 60 students of Grades 1 to 8 from Dumaine School. They are under the direction of their teachers Miss Frazer, Miss Gibbs and Miss Hockaday. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Member from Morris. On behalf of all members of the committee I welcome you here.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, at noon I had finished dealing with one point in my remarks, that was the question of the government charging adoption fees in respect of a married man adopting the children of his wife from a previous marriage or the children of his wife that were born out of wedlock. Now I want to deal with the second part of what I had to say which deals with the plight of deserted wives and of wives who are living separate and apart from their husbands under separation orders, separation agreements or orders made under the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act or judicial separations made under the Matrimonial Causes Act.

Now in the case of a deserted wife, the Criminal Code provides that the evidence that a man has left his wife and has failed for a period of any one month subsequent to the time of his so leaving, to make provision for her maintenance or for the maintenance of any child of his, under the age of 16 years, is prima facie evidence that he has failed without lawful excuse to provide necessities of life for them. The failure on his part under that section of the code is a duty which he must perform and his failure to so perform that duty constitutes a criminal offense. In cases such as these, where the wife has been deserted by her husband or he has left her, the Crown in right of the Province of Manitoba, would take the legal action against that husband to bring him back, and would prosecute that husband in the proper courts.

The point that I want to make is this: that where a wife and a husband are living separate and apart from each other, under a separation agreement, in which the husband perhaps gives to the wife the custody of the children and agrees to pay for her support and maintenance and that of the children, monthly or other sums; or where they are living separate and apart under an order granted by a police magistrate or a county court judge, under the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act, and there is an order in that case too for him to pay maintenance and support; or where they are living under a judicial separation, with maintenance provided by the court for the wife, if in any of these cases, the husband makes default it is incumbent upon the wife, under our law as it stands today, to institute the necessary legal action to bring him to court. Now my feeling in the matter is very strong. I feel that not only does it place a woman in a very very embarrassing position; I think it's perhaps beneath her dignity to have to resort to court action on her own behalf to enforce an order. My suggestion is that there is no reason in the world why there should be any distinction made between a man who has left his wife and they are not living separate and apart under any order, and where the Crown takes action against him to enforce his duty to maintain his wife and children -- there should be no distinction made between that case and the case of a man who is living separate and apart from his wife under an order of a court or under an ordinary separation agreement.

I think it is the duty of the Crown in these cases to take the action on behalf of the wife. And I think too, that all the resources of the Crown should be brought to bear on that man, to insure that he will carry out his obligation to his wife and to his children. I feel too that placing the woman in the position where she has to take the legal action against her husband is not only embarrassing, and it's not only beneath her dignity, but in my opinion it also prevents any reasonable chance of a reconciliation between these parties, because my own experience has shown me that once a woman has to take action against her husband to enforce an order for maintenance support against him, the feeling between these two becomes very embittered and the chances of a reconciliation become less likely. I feel that if the Crown did enforce that obligation against the husband, and used all the resources of theirs for that purpose, that there would be a better chance - in some instances of course, not in all - of bringing about a reconciliation between the parties.

I would therefore urge, Mr. Chairman, that two amendments be made to our law. One would have to be made by the Federal Government under the Criminal Code to also make it an offence for a man to fail to provide for his wife where he has been directed to do so by a court.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . . of competent jurisdiction, or where he fails to provide for his wife under a separation agreement. I can't see where we can make any distinction between the case of a man leaving his wife and the Crown taking action against him, and the case of a man defaulting under a court order in favour of his wife where she, under the present law, has to take the necessary legal action.

So I suggest that one amendment would have to be to the Criminal Code making it an offence and making it a legal presumption that if a man who was separated from his wife, under a separation agreement or under a court order, and failed to provide for that wife for a period of at least one month, that would prima facie constitute failure on his part under the section of the code to provide reasonable maintenance and support for that wife and give rise to criminal action. I would also suggest, too, that under our Wives and Children's Maintenance Act that we provide that the Crown in the right of Manitoba shall enforce any orders that are made against a husband for the support and maintenance of his wife, either under the Wives and Children's Maintenance Act or under any other act.

Recently, along with the Honourable Member for Wellington, I had occasion to attend a meeting at Knox Church which was called by a group of individuals, deserted wives, who go under the name of the Minus One group. That conference was convened by the daughter of the Honourable Member for Emerson and I believe that there was a member from each party in this House invited to attend that meeting, and I can assure you, judging by the remarks at that meeting that night and the number of individuals that were there, each one being a woman who was living separate and apart from her husband, and how they had described their difficulties of enforcing orders against them and the help that was required, I came away from that meeting more convinced than ever that the Crown should take part in enforcing these orders just the same way as it takes legal action against a husband who has deserted his wife and is guilty of failure to provide for her under the provisions of the Criminal Code.

I would also make another suggestion and that is this, that under our divorce laws as they presently stand, if a woman is sued for divorce by her husband she has the right to apply to the Court for security for costs and the Court will grant her an order for security for costs. Now I think in the case of a wife who has to bring an action against her husband under The Wives and Children's Maintenance Act, that the Crown should see that that husband, provided he has the means to do so, will provide legal counsel for her. I have been in Court so many times when husbands have appeared in court with high paid counsel and the wife has had to rely upon counsel being appointed by the municipality in which she lives.

Now I am not suggesting that the counsel appointed by the municipality wasn't as good as the counsel which the husband had, but the point that I want to make is this, that if the husband has money enough to employ counsel, it should also be made incumbent upon him to provide the necessary means of employing counsel for his wife, or as an alternative, I think that counsel should be provided by the wife under the Free Legal Aid section that we have in the code that we intend to introduce here. But in any event, I am satisfied of two things, that these prosecutions should be instituted by the Crown and not by the woman herself, and that she should be provided with counsel. If her husband is able to pay for that counsel, he should be made to pay for it, but if he has not the means to pay for that counsel, it should be provided by the Crown.

Another matter in respect of which these deserted wives were very concerned was the question of the fair rights in the property owned by their husbands. Now the law as it presently stands, the only right that they have in respect of the property of their husbands is under The Dower Act, and that is an inchoate right. It is only something which acts as a power of veto and all that a wife can do is to file a caveat against the land owned by her husband which constitutes their homestead and thus warn people of the fact that it is a homestead and that her consent is necessary to any disposition.

Now these women at that meeting, as far as I can make out, they were even suggesting that we should give consideration in Manitoba to introducing the California law, community of property. Now I don't know whether we are prepared to go that far or not, but at the same time I think it is incumbent upon us to take a good look at our laws in Manitoba respecting wives and husbands, particularly in respect of the remedies that should be provided for breaches of the marital contract, and also in respect of the law which we should enact to ensure that where a woman is deserted by her husband, or where a husband and wife are living separate and apart from each other, some protection should be given to that woman to prevent the husband from dissipating his assets to her disadvantage.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . .

I know that this group of Minus One did appear before the Deputy Attorney-General a couple of days ago and did present - I don't know whether it was a written brief or whether they made oral representations - but I know they made considerable representation to the Deputy Attorney-General and I do hope that the government will give serious consideration to the advisability of implementing as many of these recommendations as possible, because I think that they are reasonable recommendations and I think that in a modern world, in a modern economy, that sooner or later they will have to be implemented.

These were the two matters, Mr. Chairman, with which I wished to deal in respect of the Department of Welfare. I see the Honourable Member for Elmwood is not in his seat but there is a motion which I would like to make respecting the Minister's salary, and if the Honourable Member for Elmwood takes the same exception to that motion as he has taken on other occasions, I hope that he will use this forum for expressing these objections and not resort or attempt to resort to the private radio stations in Manitoba to get his point of view put over the air. So I therefore wish to move, Mr. Chairman, that Item 1 (a) Minister's Compensation, Salary and Representation Allowance of \$18,000 be reduced to the level of the 1966-67 appropriation of \$12,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion say Aye -- I beg your pardon. Call in the members.

MR. LYON: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, until after the voice vote has been taken.

MR. CAMPBELL: They'll have to come anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A counted standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 14; Nays 40.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the words "and Representation Allowance" be struck out of Item 17 - 1 (a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, when this motion was put on the last occasion I said that I interpreted the motion as simply saying that the member that moved it felt that the \$3,000 should be taxable. That's the way I interpret the resolution. We're not saying my honourable friends shouldn't have it, but what he is saying and what we have said to date is that it should be taxable, and you will recall that I said on that occasion that if any member of the front bench would get up and tell me whether or not that it was quite in order for them to submit an expense account when they are on work - on government work - and present it to the government and have it paid, then I might take a different position to the resolution that is before us. But it is quite evident to me, and certainly it must be quite evident to everyone in the House, that not only does a Cabinet member have a free car when he's on government business, gasoline paid by the people and all of his legitimate expenses paid by the people, but he wants an additional \$3,000 for out-of-pocket expenses. Now for the life of me I cannot see what other out-of-pocket expenses there are. What other ones are there in addition to the ones for which they submit a bill? I hope that on this occasion someone will get up and explain the difference, explain why it should be taxable. Why should they have an additional \$3,000 that is tax-free? Why shouldn't it be taxable, that's what I would like to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there's two motions that we've been repeating on every Minister, and one of course deals with the way this was done. We feel that we should have a discussion here before the election -- it should have been before the election and it should be here where these things could be discussed. I certainly, as you know, supported this motion and I find that this one here is even more important, especially after the way that the Provincial Treasurer spoke yesterday, and I'll just quote just a few lines from what he said and I don't think the members will need too much explanation. On Page 1115 of Hansard this is what the Provincial Treasurer said: "There is a general attitude on the other side of the House, 'Soak the rich. Let's take the people of high incomes and get it out of them.' And this falls within the pattern of what I have just said: let's see who they are, how many there are, what assets have they got, what taxable sources are there in that class of people. I was very interested to find that we have got 330,000 income tax payers in the Province of Manitoba, and of the 330,000 how many do you think have gross incomes of \$10,000 or more? Just 10,000 people, gross income before allowing any exemptions that is, according to the Income Tax Act. Just 3.3 percent of the people in the province have incomes of that size or more.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . These are the rich that are to be soaked and any additional income tax that could be extracted from these people would be so small as to be hardly countable in the total."

Mr. Chairman, how can anybody have the nerve to make a statement like this and then not support this motion. There's 3.3 of the people of Manitoba that get \$10,000 or more, and this is before anything has been taken away - the taxes. It boils down to what I said the first time I introduced this resolution, Mr. Chairman, that we are the people here, it's this government and the members of this House who are imposing taxes on people. This is our duty, and we should at least pretend or show a little bit of sincerity if nothing else, and when we say that there is -- the Provincial Treasurer, who's laughing his head off right now, said that there's only 3.3 percent of the people of Manitoba who are in this bracket, therefore we shouldn't soak the rich, and when he says that they've looked everywhere before they decided to bring in this tax, I would say that we at least are trying to show a little bit of example so the people will have a little more confidence in the politicians and politics will not be known as a dirty word around this province and around this country. Legally this is right. This was meant as one-third of the income of the politician, and one-third of \$4,800 - that's reasonable enough, you have campaigns, you have different expenses - but here the Cabinet members who tried their utmost to bring in a very unfair, to say the least to be very charitable, unfair pension a few years ago, these people are getting even now, because they are getting a raise in salary and then they have another \$3,000 that is tax-free.

It is the principle of this, the principle of this we've got -- this is the same government that has been talking about the ability-to-pay. They made a big thing a few years ago to bring in this income tax because it was a real tax, and finally Mr. Diefenbaker in Ottawa had given them the chance to bring in what they've wanted, what they had wanted for many years, a tax that would look at the people that had the ability-to-pay. And then we have a statement such as we had yesterday in this House and these people are mocking, are making mockery out of this, they're finding a loophole in the Act, something that certainly was not the intent of this Act, and they are saying - well, there's \$3,000 more we will not pay taxes on.

Now besides this, I say - and nobody has refuted this - I say that every Cabinet Minister's expenses is taken off of this department, everything comes out of the department, and if one of them would stand up and say, "All right, I will take this \$3,000 tax-free but I will pay all my expenses," maybe I can understand. Do we realize the Honourable Provincial Treasurer said that there was 3.3 people with \$10,000 before anything taken off, and what have we got here - \$22,500 or \$22,800?

There's rumours that maybe there'll be an increase for the members. If there's an increase for the members, they would be increased - theirs would be increased \$2,000 or so. One-third of this, again tax-free, would make it over \$5,000 - \$5,000 tax-free and there's 3.3 percent of the people of Manitoba that make \$10,000 or more. Does that make any sense, Mr. Chairman? Besides that they have a car that's paid for, all the gas is paid for, everything else is paid for, they have people doing their work. I say that this is mocking - Parliament is mocking the people of Manitoba and I say that it is most unjust, especially after the statement of the Honourable Minister yesterday afternoon.

I certainly would ask everybody, especially the backbenchers on the other side, to realize that they have a responsibility. It's all right, we have a loyalty to our party but we also have a loyalty to the people that elected us here. We have a loyalty to the people of Manitoba, we have a loyalty to these people on which we imposed a heat tax not long ago. I'm thinking about the members of the north. They remember this. There was a big heat tax on these people and now a five percent sales tax - education tax if you please. So I would think that if these people realize what their responsibilities are, if they're not just rubber stamps of the front bench, they certainly will help us and vote -- help the people of Manitoba, I should say, not help us, and vote in favour of this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A counted standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 14; Nays, 40.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may proceed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, this morning when the Honourable Minister of Welfare was making his spirited defence of his department I felt that he made a few statements that could not be allowed to stand uncorrected.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this government is contributing a great deal to the business in Canada at this time. Every time they find themselves in a bit of trouble, they scream blue murder about what Ottawa is doing, and as I recall this morning, the Minister of Welfare followed this tried and true practice of this government and started to decry the old age supplement legislation that was recently passed in Ottawa, and I believe he decried it on the grounds that it was a Means Test and he deplored this, thought it was terrible and he had some harsh words to say.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to set the record straight somewhat and try and do something to correct the impression that he may have left. I have here in my hands excerpts of the speech made by the Minister who introduced this resolution in Ottawa and I would like to quote out of it in part, and he says - the Honourable Allen McEachen is speaking - "In this resolution Parliament is being asked to consider a program which guarantees old age security recipients an income of from \$1,260 a year or \$105.00 a month. Approximately 900,000 senior citizens now on modest incomes will benefit by this program in 1967. This number will increase over the next few years as the age for old age security is lowered from 68 to 65. The program will cost Canadian taxpayers between 260 and \$280 million in 1967.

"I know one main concern of members is with the method of determining levels of benefits available under this program. Some persons have attempted to attach a Means Test label to the program while others have talked about a Needs Test. Because it involves the provision of a guarantee of a basic minimum income, it is necessary that a norm of eligibility be employed. There is no other way to administer or operate a guaranteed income program of this kind, but I can assure members that the norm is, in my view, a simple and acceptable one. It does not involve what we commonly refer to as a test of means or needs. I hope that members will resist the temptation to get part of the mileage out of the proposal on this ground and that no attempt, either intentionally or inadvertently, will be made to spread the spectre of a Means Test among our older people. I repeat: the norm envisaged under this program is a far far cry from the Means Test. I am confident that when the guaranteed income supplement is in operation a majority, if not all the eligible older people of Canada, will agree with this assessment.

"The purpose of this program is to provide maximum assistance to those on modest incomes. I suggest that the contemporary guaranteed income approach is the most effective and most responsible way of achieving this objective. Lest I be accused of hair-splitting or of indulging in semantics, I would examine for a few minutes what is involved in tests of means and needs. A Means Test means just that; it involves an examination of the nooks and crannies of a person's financial status, the money he has in the bank, whether he owns a car or a home, the ability of relatives to contribute to his support, his earnings and so on. Under a Needs Test, the other side of the ledger is examined. Its purpose is to determine the gap between what a person has and what he needs for an adequate decent existence and to base benefits on the difference. Under a Needs Test, income is also taken into account but the emphasis is on meeting needs on a flexible basis.

"The program proposed in this resolution is based on neither of these approaches. The criterion is a universal guaranteed income, a floor below which an individual's income will not fall. The objective is to provide a flow of income and the definition or determination of an individual's flow of income is identical with that used for income tax purposes. This is a simple, acceptable and effective way of determining eligibility and calculating levels of benefits. No information will be asked for that is not already required for income tax purposes. There will be no snooping; no prying into financial affairs; no demeaning questions. This program is an innovation, the application of a contemporary technique to what has been a continuing problem in modern industrialized society, the provision of adequate income to people who, because of age, are not able to earn on their own.

"Members are aware, I am sure, of the current public interest in the guaranteed income technique. It has come in for considerable public discussion and there have been suggestions that the approach be applied on a broader basis. Many believe that the guaranteed income mechanism provides the best hope for an adequate income maintenance in our era where more and more jobs involving human labour are being turned over to machines."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to read all of this but I think it's important that

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . the impression left by the Honourable Minister is corrected and not allowed to go unchallenged. Perhaps he supports the view that members of his Party took in Ottawa at the time. If he does, well this is his privilege, and he can make representations through his office here at the time the legislation was being considered and he can ask his members of his stripe to have it changed down there also, but to stand up in this House after the legislation is in, and he had raised no objections at that time, I think is a very unfair criticism to make of people who are not here to defend themselves. I think that he should acknowledge this fact. If he has a valid criticism of the legislation he should make the valid criticism and not make a blanket statement calling it a Means Test and something that is implied as being quite unfair to the older people.

Earlier on he used my name in stating that I had been critical at times of welfare spending, and again this is a blanket statement. If he would like to document the things I've said I will answer, but I certainly resent a blanket statement that infers that any member is against welfare spending. But there are some things about welfare spending that I do feel rather strongly about. For instance, I don't believe that taxpayers should be called upon to pay, through his taxes and then into welfare, that he should be called upon to pay the water bill of a man that makes \$1.75 an hour. I don't think this is valid spending in the welfare field, yet it happens. I know of documented cases, or a case I can give to the Minister if he wishes. I believe that the administration of welfare needs tightening up when cases like this happen. And don't let my honourable friend get up and start to interpret this as being against welfare where the need is real and apparent and is for people who cannot help themselves. I also don't think that welfare should be called upon to make home improvements for a person who is making around \$3,000 a year. I'm thinking now of the case where a person who is employed most of the year on construction, he has a modest home it is true, with an oil heater and inside tank and the welfare come along and put in an outside tank for him. This man is earning construction wages and I don't think that's right.

MR. CARROLL: Municipal welfare?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm talking about the Department of Welfare -- municipal -- provincial welfare.

MR. CARROLL: In the City of Portage la Prairie?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. I can give you the names. I don't think it's proper administration of welfare that a man can bring in a household item to be repaired and then he takes it out to his hunting lodge. I'm talking now about the administration of the welfare. This is the type of spending that I don't think is right, where taxpayers have to pay for programs that go off in different directions and end up like that. So when my honourable friend says that I'm against welfare spending in a blanket manner, I'm referring to some of the administration. For him to get up and make statements such as he did this morning, and I happened to be on the other side of the room and I didn't quite get everything he said, but I understood him to use the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the speeches he had made about welfare. Now this is what I don't like about your administration and welfare. It is not against programs to help people where the need is there.

MR. MOLGAT: Do you want to answer a question . . . . .

MR. CARROLL: I did just want to deal with this, but . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it's a long time since I have spoken on the item of - in fact on any item in connection with the Department of Welfare - but on this occasion I thought that I would break that silence of a few years and ask a few questions of the Honourable the Minister and the administration. Before doing so though I would like to comment on what the Minister said this morning when he seemed to be taking this Party to task for what he esteemed to be a lack of uniformity in our policy.

Now I want to tell the Honourable the Minister that this Party does have differing views on some matters and I guess at this stage I should announce that in what I am going to say I'm speaking definitely for myself, which I believe to be my right in a free Assembly. Speaking for myself, it is not necessarily the views of the Party although I have good reason to believe that a good many members of my Party agree with this. I have equally good reason to believe that a good many members of the Government Party also agree with it, and when my honourable friend the Minister says that we are lacking in uniformity, the difference between the two sides of the House, Mr. Chairman, seems to be this, that we do have some differing views here and we have a right to express them. The folks on the other side have differing views too, but they don't seem to be allowed to express them. I know of some of

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . the members on the other side of the House who have expressed to me views along the general lines that I am going to express but they don't express them in the House.

I ask my honourable friend the Minister, or anybody else who would care to answer over there, do you really believe -- does anybody really believe that all the members on that side of the House are in agreement with all the policies that this government has been sponsoring and is now sponsoring? Do you believe that all of them over there agree with the implementation of the sales tax right now? Not by any means. No, sir. No, they don't. The difference between the ones over here and the ones over there is that we can exercise the right of free speech; we can express our points of view and our opinions.

Would anybody try to tell me, the Minister or anybody else, that all the members on that side of the House, leave alone this one, believe in the compulsory features of the present educational program? There are some who don't, and there are compulsory features in that program. I've said time and time again that I'm prepared to pay a lot of attention to the position of the experts on the academic side of the educational program, that that's very good, but on some of these other features I'm sure that not everybody on that side -- but they go along for the sake of the Party policy. Do you mean to tell me that everybody agrees with the compulsory features of the vegetable marketing program? You bet they don't. Not the ones over there either. The difference here is that we can express what we think, and that's what I'm going to take advantage of doing now.

Mr. Chairman, I have been most interested in this little booklet - handbook - and I appreciate the courtesy of the Minister in making it available to us - "The Social Service Audit Handbook." I can't refrain from reading one paragraph on to the record here because this is what is stated on Page 3 under the heading: "The Present Situation. In twenty years" - and I'm quoting now - "In twenty years since World War 2, Winnipeg has almost doubled its population but its social problems have not merely doubled. They are also more complex and multiplying rapidly as people succumb to the pressures of a fast industrialized urban life. Since 1946 over fifty new agencies have been set up to handle these new problems. Other agencies have been expanding their programs. However, there has been no substantial change in the methods of co-ordinating the work of different agencies or in the way in which agencies do their work. The basic structure of planning, co-ordinating and delivering services remains shaped to the needs of 1946."

Well, thank goodness for the admission in this little handbook of that being the fact. My honourable friends after telling us for all the years that they have been in office of how they were reorganizing and co-ordinating and improving all of these services, now present us with a booklet that tells us that the basic structures for planning, co-ordinating and delivering services remains shaped to the needs of 1946. That's not what the Ministers have been telling us through the years. The Ministers have been telling us - there have been three of them - they have been telling us all the time that these policies are not just a case of handing out money to people, these are policies that are going to rehabilitate people. Instead of just giving financial help, they are going to develop the basic strength of the individual.

I have some quotes here that are taken from the time -- and any suggestions that I make, any statements that I am making, Mr. Chairman, I am not going back to those dark ages before my honourable friends came into office. I wouldn't think of going back to 1958 or any time like that, because of course there were unenlightened policies at that time that my honourable friends decided to correct and they were going to correct them - and you can document this case ad infinitum - they were going to correct them by doing away with the need for welfare. They were going to have rehabilitation services, and this is a sound and basic program.

"The policy is not just to respond with a relief cheque." This is one of the quotes of a few years ago. The spokesman had reiterated time and time again - and here I'm quoting from my honourable friend who is the Minister of Education - here is a quote: "Time and time again," he said, "that you can't solve complicated social problems by handing out money." That wasn't the way to do it. "The well-being" - and well-being is taken from the bill that my honourable friend was so proud of introducing back in 1959 that he said was one of the most important bills ever to be introduced into this Legislative Assembly, bar none. It spoke of the well-being of the individual. My honourable friend's report of that year said: "The well-being of the individual can't be met by financial help alone. It includes" - here's a quote - "a constructive use of the strength of the client," and they were helping people to become self-supporting.

Now my comparisons are not with the time that the former government was in office; my

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . comparisons are with the year after my honourable friends had had 21 months in office. They had had the benefit of sitting here and watching the former government deal, as they said, so unsuccessfully with these programs; they had had the opportunity of developing - through the course of criticizing our administration - developing and consolidating and perfecting their own plans; they had had the benefit of working for some months on the estimates with which we had provided them when we went out of office; but then they had had the benefit after that of having put in these enlightened programs of their own and the very first time that they put them in they at least lived up to what they'd been saying, Mr. Chairman, because they did boost the numbers of civil servants. They said that we didn't have enough so they boosted them from 106 right away the first full year that they were in office to 169, because one of the major problems, one of the reasons that we were not getting these people off relief was that we were not rehabilitating them in the way that should have been done because we didn't have enough social service workers - we didn't have enough trained people.

So they corrected that. They went from 106 that we had had up to 169 and they gave more than a 50 percent increase in the financial support to the Welfare Department - increased it by more than 50 percent - and the comparisons that I want to lay before the House now are the comparisons of that year after those changes had been made. It wouldn't do to compare them with the time of 1958. We so frequently hear 1958 spoken of in here and this comparison of course would be much more emphatic if I used 1958, but I use the first full year that had been the administration of my honourable friends and I use the comparison with the figures that they had after boosting our estimates by more than 50 percent and here are some, as I see them, of the highlights of that program. And I raise this to ask my honourable friend the Minister, where are we going in Welfare Services? What is the program now? This program has been tried; it's still being tried. These are the results which I'd like to lay before the committee, and I say, where do we go from here? What's next? Who's going to point the way from here on? This group? This is going to point the way? These are the same type of people, the same type of programs, the same agencies that have been working all the way along.

Here is some of the comparisons and they're not exhaustive, of course, but here are some of them. Taking fiscal year 1960 -- I like my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer's method of designating the years - fiscal year so and so. This is, as he pointed out, the year ending in March 31, 1960 - fiscal 1960 - and that I remind my honourable friends is when this government, with all the experience they had and all the ideas that they had and all the improvements that they had made, had been in office for 21 months. Under the item Salaries, in 1960 there were 169 people - if anybody wants the comparison with 1958 I don't mind giving it, but I'm not using the comparison with 1958 because I want to use the comparison of my honourable friends themselves after they had had the opportunity of improving the situation. Salaries - 169 people were \$540,000, and I'm giving round figures. In this year, Mr. Chairman, in this year we have 370 people under Salaries - 370. Now they had had 21 months to work at this, they'd got all ready, they'd got 169 but now they've got 370 and the salary bill instead of being a little over half a million is \$2,114,000 in round figures. Supplies, expenses, etc., had been boosted considerably. In 1960 they were \$118,000; they're now \$354,000 - three times as much.

We had had two items, Social Assistance and Mothers Allowance. My honourable friends had in the very first year grouped them under what was called Social Allowances and the total was \$4,684,000. Do you know what that is now - and this is the big item of the Welfare expenditures, and as my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie has said, we're not complaining about people in need getting assistance, this is not the point, what we do complain against is administration and we do ask the question for the benefit of the people who are getting this assistance, where do we go from here? This program isn't working. What do we try?

Mothers Allowance and Social Assistance, grouped under Social Allowances, were \$4,684,000 in 1960; this year they're \$19,851,000. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but on the other hand we have to admit the fact that my honourable friends have taken on 100 percent of some of the people that were partially paid for -- at least partially paid for by the municipalities before that.

Ward Maintenance. My honourable friends in 1960 had appropriated \$928,000; this year it's \$2,878,000. Grants to Charitable Institutions who work with them were \$410,000; this year they're \$1,314,000. Assistance to Municipal Aid Expenditures were \$903,000; this year they're a million dollars.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)

There are some other small items that I won't bother mentioning but the total, to total them up, in 1960, after my honourable friends had put in their new program, after they had put on more than a 50 percent increase in staff, after they had increased the financial support by more than 50 percent, the total was \$7,648,000 and the total now is \$27,704,000, three and three-quarter times as much as it was eight years ago; three and three-quarter times as much as it was in the new and revised and improved and enlightened programs that my honourable friends themselves put in, the program that was to - not end, I suppose even they were not optimistic enough in the halcyon days of their early years in office to say that it would end this sort of thing but certainly it was going to improve it; three and three-quarter times as much in a time that my honourable friends at least say we have very buoyant conditions.

My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer, my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the others who speak about the conditions say that these are extra good times. They say that we have practically no unemployment. Well, if these are good times and if we have practically no unemployment, why does this continue to grow in this way and what is the program for the future? What are we going to do to arrest this trend? If this is the case in good times, Mr. Chairman, and in the times that we have, according to my honourable friends, practically no unemployment, what can we expect in difficult times? And what is the program from here on?

Now I listened to my honourable friend the Minister this morning when he was replying to a question that had been asked him by the Honourable Member for Rhineland and I understood him to say that the big difference and the big reason for the increase was that the elderly people were living longer than they did before and the costs were going up, but the real rise in costs are not in that field although there are undoubtedly some there, but they're in the two that are grouped together under Social Allowances.

Mr. Chairman, I went through the Annual Report - the first time I had done so for quite a long while - and I checked on some of the tables and I left out every one where it was a case of the elderly people because I recognize that that is a different situation, but when you took the Mothers Allowance recipients, shouldn't there be some improvement there in good times, and if the programs have been working out well, shouldn't there be a change? But I found that in 1960 that the Mothers Allowance recipients were 1,476 people and in this year given in this report, fiscal 1966, the number in March of that year appeared to be 7,887 at the last count.

I looked at the relief recipients in unorganized territories, and like my honourable friend for Gladstone I ask this special question with regard to the employable people. Unemployable people like the elderly I admit are in a different category, quite different, but for the employable people, there must be a difference in these times as compared with conditions that are not so buoyant, there must be a difference in these times in what could be done when we have full employment. If we have full employment, if we're needing people, then for goodness sakes wouldn't it be a kindness to these people - and I'm talking about the employable - wouldn't it be a kindness to them to give some of them some of the jobs that are available rather than having my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce running over the European continent to find people to come and work here. My honourable friend can say, "Well, but they aren't trained for this," but one of the basic parts of their program was to train them. There are many jobs where these people are perfectly - perfectly well able to take the positions now.

Well, through the tables here. Children under guardianship - in 1962 was the figure that -- well it's given right in this report - 2,200; fiscal 1966, 3,000-odd. Table 11 on Page 25, days of care provided and the cost of ward maintenance. In fiscal 1962, the days of care provided were 600,000-odd; in fiscal 1966, 900,000-odd -- and these after the program had been in effect for eight years, after three and three-quarter times as many people are working on this, working with them, after three and three-quarter times as much money is being spent on them, all of these continue to rise.

Another point that I noticed here, of course this is a factor in the financial picture, is in increases in the per diem rates granted to Children's Aid Societies by the Welfare Advisory Committee. Back in 1960, and I stay with 1960, I don't want to go further back in there because I recognize that that's back in antiquity, I recognize that those are - what does my honourable friend the Attorney-General call them - the Dinosaur days, but in 1960 we had emerged from the caves, Mr. Chairman. We had to - we had to, this is right - and we had

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . done it under the distinguished leadership of my honourable friend who now interrupts me, and he gave us a most eloquent description in this House about what this bill of his was going to do, and this is what it has done. We're spending three and three-quarter times as much as we did before. And what's the program from here on in?

But to get back to the per diem rate in 1960. Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg - \$2.30, now up to \$3.32; Eastern Judicial District - \$1.87, now up to \$2.24; Western - \$1.72, now up to \$2.50; Central - \$1.65, now up to \$2.20; and the one that seems to have gone up by leaps and bounds are the Jewish Child and Family Service, which were just even with the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg back in 1960 at \$2.30, and they are now up to \$7.79. I suppose that there's some explanation for that change.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse and reiterate what the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has said, that we are not averse to helping the needy, and I do not criticize programs that are directed toward that end. Certainly I do not criticize programs that have in mind the retraining or the rehabilitation of these people, but to the extent that those programs have been in effect and have been in any way effective, then the picture should be getting better, not worse; and to the extent that we have the buoyant conditions that are spoken of by the Honourable Minister, it should be easier to place the people whom we rehabilitate and whom we retrain; and to the extent that the employment situation in Manitoba is good, that there's very little unemployment, then we should be able to make use of these folks who are rehabilitated and retrained.

I know that a lot of my honourable friends, and particularly those who sit in the New Democratic Party and some, particularly the front benchers, not the backbenchers, not even the second row so much because there are some pretty practical people in the second row, but my honourable friends in the front row, they expect me to revert to the good old days of 1958; they expect me to suggest that they get back to doing things the way they were done in those times; but I'm not advocating that, I'm advocating that we look ahead and that we look for some improvements in these programs.

But I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister, has anything been done recently with regard to a program that was suggested almost two years ago which is headed in the Winnipeg Tribune in large type: "Baizley supports new Welfare Plan," and I quote from it, Tribune of Saturday, March 6, 1965, and it's the most recent article that I could find on this particular item: "Provincial Labour Minister Obie Baizley has given his support to a 'work for welfare' plan now under consideration by the City's Health and Welfare Committee." Well now, if I proposed a "work for welfare" plan, then you'd all say, well that's to be expected, this is what you'd expect, this hard-hearted individual who wants to grind the poor down and wants to make the welfare workers work for their money. You'd expect that. But this says that Provincial Labour Minister Obie Baizley, and knowing the uniformity of view that my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare advocates, I would expect that his colleague didn't make this suggestion without his Cabinet being in agreement.

The article goes on: "Dr. Baizley said Friday, anything that can be done to encourage self-improvement among these people would be of benefit to the whole community. We look forward to meeting with the City's committee, and the committee," says the article, "is investigating the possibility of getting welfare recipients to take jobs if they are fit to work, learn a trade, go to school to improve their education." But all of these things were being done by my honourable friends away back in 1960. What has been done in regard to this and what in the last two years since the honourable the Minister of Labour was advocating it? He wasn't alone in advocating it: he had some support. But he hedged a little bit here - I think maybe some of his colleagues had gotten to him - "Dr. Baizley said in an interview Friday that, despite his initial support of the idea, he doubted whether any segment of the community would favour compulsory employment of welfare recipients."

But there's one man here that didn't back up on it. The "work for welfare" scheme also got enthusiastic support from Magistrate Isaac Rice, and here's a quote -- did I hear some chuckles? -- (Interjection) -- Good. It's not, eh? Then why were my honourable friends laughing? The "work for welfare" scheme also got enthusiastic support from Magistrate Isaac Rice. "It's wonderful. I suggested four years ago that these people should be put to work." That would be about the time my honourable friend the Minister of Education was getting this program rolling well. "That's when my fight with the Welfare Department started." That's what he said. "All I ask is why did they wait so long to smarten up."

But Magistrate Rice and Labour Minister Baizley were not the only ones either.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . Magistrate Ian Dubiensi said he thinks the idea has considerable merit, so it got a lot of support. And Mayor Stephen Juba got into the act. Mayor Stephen Juba said, "Work for welfare proposal would probably go to City Council March 15th for a policy decision - permission for the committee to continue its study. I don't want to make any decision until a comprehensive study has been made." Well, he's certainly taking his tip from the present government in that. Alderman Grant McLeod said, "There's some merit to the proposal but it's too sketchy now for me to come out with a definite statement."

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, I would like to ask the Minister, does not a program of this kind have a lot of merit? I ask that in consideration of the people themselves. I think it's tragic when people, because of continuance on welfare programs through the years, seem to come to accept the philosophy that they can be on a mere dole almost for their lifetime. There's something wrong if in a community where we have buoyant conditions, even as buoyant as they are - and I'm not accepting either the words of the optimistic Ministers or the critics at face value - but taking the condition as we know it to exist, there's something wrong when under these conditions of comparative buoyancy and comparatively full employment, if we can't find something better than this kind of a method. I am speaking in the interests of the people themselves and I'm certainly not decrying proper programs, but I cannot look at these figures without raising the question, after eight years of this program and seeing what has happened, where do we go from here and what constructive measures has the Minister to suggest to take care of it.

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like first of all to say that the New Democratic Party has often been stamped by outsiders and the public as being the welfare Party and the welfare state Party. I for one, Mr. Speaker, would like to say that I, as an individual, would like to see as few welfare programs as possible, that I don't believe in the concept of welfare; that the concept of welfare is really the concept of charity. It has a necessary role to play but it's not something which should be an objective of the members of this Legislature, and in this I agree with the words that the Honourable Member for Lakeside quoted as having come from the now Minister of Education with regard to the objectives of society. I think that a society that has too large a welfare program doesn't really show a failure in the people who are receiving welfare; what it shows is that there has been a failure in ourselves. Somehow, people in this society haven't been given either the opportunity or haven't found the initiative or the incentive to create the best that is within them. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that possibly where we do differ from some of the other Parties and some other individuals in society - the leading exponent of whom appears to be a certain magistrate down at Winnipeg Police Court - is that we don't believe, we refuse to accept the fact that people are on welfare because they wish to be there. We don't see this as being a human objective to get on to the Welfare rolls. We don't see a person desiring to live under the circumstances which welfare doles permit; and in saying this, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that the soup kitchens, the dole, relief, welfare, are all characteristics not of a particular form of society. We can't identify it either with a socialist society or a free enterprise society. They are things that exist because society is imperfect, and whatever type of system is devised there will be people who do not find that that system creates the best in them. But Mr. Speaker, I for one refuse to blame the people. I say somewhere they have been failed and they have been failed by the people who -- we have to take some of the responsibility for these people not being as productive to society and as productive to their own fulfilment as they might otherwise be. So I'd like to make that plain firstly, Mr. Speaker, that this Party is not a welfare Party; it's not a welfare state Party; it's a Party that believes that citizens can and wish to play a productive role and that where they fail to do so it's not the fault of the individual but somehow they have, either through misadventure or through society not offering them the proper initiative, somehow they haven't been able to develop themselves, and that's a misfortune, Mr. Speaker, possibly more for themselves than it is for the budgetary figures.

But there were some more specific points that I want to make, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to leave the philosophical now and come down to the practical. There were some points that were made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk which I would like to deal with and these relate specifically to deserted wives and - may I be even more specific - deserted mothers. The law as it presently relates to wives and children, Mr. Speaker, I think assumes, or at least intends, that every husband shall have the responsibility of supporting his children. It also intends other things; that, with qualifications, every husband has the responsibility of supporting his wife. But I think that it intends, Mr. Speaker, without qualifications, that every husband has the responsibility of supporting his children, and that is why there is a specific section of the Criminal Code which I find that the department uses with great reluctance. We can't somehow excite the Attorney-General's department into using the section of the Criminal Code which permits a prosecution of a husband who refuses to support his wife and his children. But this section is in the Code - my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk has referred to it - and it's a section, Mr. Speaker, which I think greater use should be made of, and I might say that there have been several attempts to have the Attorney-General's department work under this section but I may say that it's with great reluctance that any action is ever taken. But I think that the Civil Law also needs correction, that at the present time, under The Wives and Childrens Maintenance Act, a wife who is deserted and has the custody of her infant children has to apply to the wives and childrens' court - to the Family Court, it's called - to get maintenance for herself and for her children, or either one, that is either for herself or only for her children; and the husband has the right to come and defend his position. And Mr. Chairman, I say with some regret that the husband has in some cases been able to adopt the posture successfully - and I don't know why this should happen successfully - that not only is he not required to support his wife, but for some reason he is not required to support his children, and I don't think that that was ever the intention of the Act that a husband who was not applying for custody and who did not have the factual custody of his children, could take the position and defend himself against a wife making a claim for custody of herself and her children.

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . .

Now, let me try and clarify. He can successfully take the position, for one reason or another, that he doesn't have to support his wife. I defend his right to do so. What I'm suggesting is that he shouldn't be able to successfully take the position that he doesn't have to support his children, and as the law now stands, in one way or another - and let me assure the Minister that it happens - he can do so, and I don't think that that's the intention of the law, but the law as pronounced by certain Family Court magistrates has in effect permitted this type of thing because the Act says "without reasonable excuse" and if the husband can show that he is unemployed, then certain magistrates have held that to be "reasonable excuse." I have an Order in my office where a man I believe had six or seven children, but he said that he couldn't afford to support them and the magistrate found indeed that he couldn't afford to support them and therefore there was no Order against him.

Now what I'm suggesting, Mr. Minister, to be specific, is that a wife who has de facto custody of her children, who has been deserted, or even if not deserted is separated from her husband, should be able to go down to the Family Court and by precipe, that is, by merely reciting these facts, obtain an order that the husband be required to support his children at least in the amount that she would be entitled to if she were receiving welfare payments. That is, that as a minimum right and before any court hearing and before any determination as to any other matter, she should have a right to go down to court, say that "this man is my husband," file her marriage certificate, file the birth certificates of her children, tell the worker that the children are living with her and, as of right, should be entitled, regardless of what else she's entitled to, she should be entitled to an Order by the judge saying that the father must support the children. Then the only question is whether or not there is a default under the Order. That is, in the meantime, various court proceedings could be taken; she could be trying to get support for herself as well, which she has a right to do; the husband could defend himself in those circumstances, which he has the right to do; he could say that he can't comply with the Order for one reason or another; but it would be a recorded responsibility of his that despite what else the wife is entitled to, without argument, without lawyers, without court cases, without costs, she should have a right to a judge's Order saying that this wife, who has custody of these infant children, shall receive from her husband a certain minimum allowance. And I'm not suggesting that that's the end of the matter. She can then go to court and show that her husband can afford more, and if she is able to demonstrate this she should be entitled to get an order for a bigger allowance, but at the very minimum she should be entitled to this type of Order against even a husband who is unemployed or in the hospital.

Now Mr. Chairman, let me now specify. The Order doesn't necessarily mean that she's going to get the money, but at least the law will say then and there that without -- unless the husband adduces a reasonable excuse for not complying with the Order, he owes his wife this responsibility. If the wife then, after she receives the Order, claims the husband to be under default, he could come to court and demonstrate that for one reason or another he couldn't fulfil it. What I am suggesting is that we should not allow the present situation to exist; that is, where a husband can come to court, defend himself, and have the court action result in a dismissal of the case against him. That is - and this has happened - that the court will not make an Order requiring him to support his children.

I, Mr. Speaker, have adopted a policy in my office. I'll defend a husband who says that he, for one reason or another, doesn't want to support his wife, but if he wishes to go to court and defend against an Order requiring him to support his children and doesn't take the position that he wants custody of his children - in other words he says he wants his wife to have the children and he doesn't want to support them - then he's to find another lawyer, and I'm suggesting that under those circumstances there be no doubt about it, that the wife be entitled to walk into the Family Court, recite the facts, get an Order with this minimum. If the wife is then able to establish with further court proceedings that her husband can afford more than this minimum, that's fine, and then the husband should pay more but he shouldn't be allowed to defend against paying anything at all, which I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is now the case.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I think we've dwelt to quite some degree on the aspect of costs of the program under the Welfare Department and certainly I'm not going to keep up the tempo in that direction. I am going to deal, rather, with what I consider the serious shortcomings on the part of the Department of Welfare.

(MR. USKIW cont'd).....

Over a number of years, going back some 10 years, I had a considerable amount to do with the assisting of people which approached me to help them get some type of social allowance, or Old Age Security, or disability pensions and so forth, and incidentally over the years I have been successful in so doing with a number of cases. But because I did take part in this type of thing I got sort of involved and sometimes peeved at the extremities which I had to go to to be able to do something for people that were, in effect, in my opinion in dire need. I recall an incident where a man of the age of 59 years of age had applied for assistance under the Disabled Pensions program and he was refused on three different occasions, and of course it came to my attention and I said, "Well, when I'm in the Norquay Building I'm going to go into those offices and see what the score is." So, sure enough, having held a number of meetings with the Department of Agriculture in the Norquay Building I would slip into the Department of Welfare and make various inquiries. And I was told that this particular gentleman was ineligible under the terms of reference of the Act, that in the opinion of the panel of doctors that he was not disabled, and knowing this man very well personally I couldn't quite realize why this decision was made. Here we have a man that was, from birth practically, paralyzed - that is, one side of him was paralyzed; he had managed to sustain himself to the age of 59 but found that he could no longer do so and had asked that someone -- he went to the municipal authorities first and then we went to the provincial authorities - he asked if someone would assist him at least partially in trying to sustain himself, and of course he was refused. I took the letter, the last letter which was sent to him, and I went to the department and I quarrelled with the department rather vigorously; and they said to me, "Well, we're sorry, but we can't assist this man. This isn't the office that you should approach." "Well," I said, "which office should I approach?" Well they said to me, "There's another office that deals with situations such as this. Cases which we reject are referred to another authority in this same building." So I said to the girl at the desk, "Well this is fine. I'm very happy that there is a way out for this gentleman, but," I said, "when you sent this gentleman a letter stating that you were unable to assist him, why did you not refer him to this other office?" And she said to me, "Well, we're not in the business of giving out information."

Now, this is a statement of fact, and I'm wondering how much beating around the bush we have when people approach seriously the government, the Department of Welfare, for assistance. This, in my opinion, was nothing more than a run-around. Now, had I not had the gumption, I must say, to stand up and condemn what I thought was a very bad system in the Department of Welfare, I doubt whether I would have gotten to first base in assisting this particular individual. However, I was happy to learn within a very short time thereafter that they had considered his application and that he was in receipt of \$59.00 a month in some form of assistance, and I would guess that it was under the Social Allowance for Unemployables. I would guess that this is where he got his assistance.

But my point here is, why didn't one department of the Department of Welfare advise this individual that there is a form of assistance available in another section of the Department of Welfare? People don't know these things. People that approach the department, they go there with cap in hand, hoping to get some favorable answer, and they don't know that there are other courses of action that they might take. So surely it's the responsibility of our people, whether or not it's the office that should be approached, these people should refer cases such as this to the proper authority. I don't think that people should go home feeling that there's no way out and that all is lost, and that only those people that have either connections such as members of the Legislature that they know well or that are willing to work for them and so forth, it isn't only these people that should have consideration. All people should have equal consideration whether they have any connections or know-how or whether they don't. So I suggest to the Honourable Minister that this is an area where I think we require a great deal of improvement. I certainly hope it isn't the case today. This was something like a year or two ago. I certainly hope that these areas are improved.

I had another instance, a man that had a series of heart attacks. He was a man that had a wooden leg for practically his entire lifetime, but he had a series of heart attacks at the age of 63 or 64, and of course he applied for a pension, and I made representation on his behalf and, of course, action wasn't forthcoming too quickly. At the same time I made representation for another gentleman that had lost his leg in an accident, and the irony of this situation was that the two applications were in at the same time, but the man that had the accident and had his leg amputated, received a cheque within about a month after I made the application for

(MR. USKIW cont'd)....him. He also had a substantial sum of money in the bank, incidentally, of his own. This was overlooked because he recognized that he had to provide himself with additional facilities, washroom facilities in the house, and this money was going to be used up. However, this other gentleman was given the same run-around. He had inspectors coming to his home asking him to carry dippers of water to determine whether he was disabled or not, asking him to walk up staircases, this type of thing. This man was actually humiliated. He, in fact, as a result of this type of treatment, phoned me one day and he said, "If this is the form of assistance that they're going to give me, I don't want it. If I have to lose dignity in accepting assistance from the Province of Manitoba, I'd rather you didn't pursue the matter." Well, of course I knew the situation. I knew that the family couldn't afford to be without assistance, and I of course ignored his request at that time and pursued the case, and eventually he did get assistance. But somehow there's no uniformity in determining whether or not a person is eligible or not eligible, and this is an area which I think needs a great deal of defining.

It seems to me that the term "disability" under the Act implies that a person is practically, if not an invalid, and I for one don't accept that this should be the definition of "disability". I can't accept this type of idea. Disability in my mind is a person who is unable to go to work to sustain himself. It shouldn't be whether a person is capable of looking after his personal needs - it's whether or not a person is capable of bringing home an income that will sustain himself or himself and his family. I think this is the criteria on which I would like to make a decision as to whether or not a person is disabled. These are the areas that I feel have not been stressed enough, and I notice in the debates in this House to date that there has been no mention with respect to problems of this nature. We've sort of skipped over these areas.

Just to illustrate my point, in the last five years there have been a total of 119 disability cases that were approved for assistance. This is in the report on Page 31 of your annual report, 1965-66. Now it's no wonder that there were only 119 cases when we find that the definition of disability is such a narrow margin - it's such a narrow definition, I should say. I feel there is a strong need in this area to re-define legislation so that there is a little more flexibility, so that we recognize that people are disabled even though they are able to look after their private need, that it's not a matter of whether or not they can sustain themselves in their own room, wash their own face and so forth. It's a matter of whether they can earn a livelihood for themselves or for their families.

The other criticism I have with respect to the disability pension scheme is the statement on Page 33 of the annual report, which tells us that the average monthly payment of disabled persons allowance as at March 31, 1966 was \$73.00 a month, \$73.00 a month. I don't know who can survive on \$73.00 a month. I'm sure I wouldn't want to and I'm sure the honourable members in this House wouldn't want to subsist on an income of \$73.00 per month. This is an area which I'm sure deserves a great deal of looking into. I don't think we should worry whether or not we're in step with the other provinces in Canada with regard to our schedules. I notice the Minister has made mention of the fact that we are in tune with the other provinces and indeed probably with the reciprocal arrangement with Ottawa. But I don't accept that we have to follow anyone. I think we have a decision to make for the people of Manitoba without reference to any other province in Canada. What they do for their people is another matter altogether, and it doesn't hurt Manitoba to take the lead in recognizing that we must provide something a little better than what we're doing for our disabled persons, for our elderly people under old age assistance and so forth.

I have here a few examples of the schedules which I'm not quite too happy with, and I'll just illustrate briefly. These are two people that I had assisted in obtaining assistance. Food, for example, \$26.00 a month. I don't know how many of us in this House would appreciate to have to sustain ourselves on \$26.00 a month, and I don't know how we arrive at \$26.00 a month. Who determines how much is required for a person to support himself insofar as food is concerned for the duration of a month? I'm certainly not happy with that provision at all. I know, when I had the first experience in approaching the Department of Welfare on behalf of one of my neighbors, I went to them and I said, "Would you tell me precisely where I might find a place of lodging or otherwise, that might feed me for \$25.00 a month because that's where I want to go." I didn't think there was a place in Manitoba. And of course the gentleman across the desk grinned at me and he said, "Yes, I can recognize your point, but," he said, "those are the schedules and we can't do anything about them." Well I recognize that certainly he couldn't do anything about them, but I think we here in this House are in a position

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . to do something about these schedules, and we don't have to be in keeping with the rest of Canada, with the other provinces on either side of us. We can take the lead in making sure that these people that are dependent on our welfare programs for their very existence, that they are treated decently and adequately and that we don't have to force them to give up their dignity in accepting welfare.

Here's the total budget for a lady receiving old age security - \$58.85 is all that this Welfare Department feels that this lady required to sustain herself for all her needs for one month - \$58.85. How many of us would want to exist on \$58.85? It's impossible. I don't know what some people do. If it wasn't for relatives and friends I'm sure they'd starve to death, and certainly this is an area where we have to give them some consideration.

The most important problem apart from the old age people, the disabled people, in my opinion are the young children, the children in foster homes, the young delinquents, if you like to put it that way because sometimes they're often referred to as delinquents. I want to make mention to you of a certain incident which took place just a few years ago in the City of Winnipeg. This had to do with a boy of ten years of age that had a number of foster homes, and he was a problem child; there's no question of that. But periodically he would decide that he didn't want to stay at his foster home and he would simply take off; he would walk away and the first thing you know they had to get the police department to look for him, and subsequently the police would pick him up somewhere in the city, and where do you think they took him - a ten year old boy? They took him to the Vaughan Street Jail. Imagine a ten year old boy in the Vaughan Street Jail. He was there a week, perhaps, sometimes three or four days. He's been there five or six times, incidentally. But at that age, to put a ten year old into the Vaughan Street Jail, to mix him in with the habitual criminals, the hardened criminals, the homosexuals, if you like. This is serious business. What are we trying to create about ten and twelve year olds when this is the way we treat them? Surely there's a need for some facility whereby these children can be placed until they are relocated. Certainly there's a need for temporary receiving homes for people in the early years of their life, for the children and the adolescents. Surely we shouldn't throw them in with the wolves, if you like to put it that way, because this is what it is in the Vaughan Street Jail. You have all types of people of all ages; of all categories; facilities for about twenty people and you find out there are about fifty in there sometimes. And here we put a ten year old child into these type of facilities. This is a most important item which I think should receive consideration, and I'm rather disappointed that in our budget apparently there is no consideration for providing these type of facilities, at least if this newspaper article is correct, and I quote: "The Manitoba Association of Social Workers has blasted the Provincial Government . . ." (Interjections)

MR. CAMPBELL: It appears to me there's a stranger sitting in the seat of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Another stranger, Mr. Chairman. I move, Mr. Chairman, that the strangers be ejected.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I think we should let them stay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think the honourable members are out of order if they would take their hats off, please.

MR. CLEMENT: . . . on a point of order, I think as long as we sit with our hat on, we can't speak with our hat on.

MR. CAMPBELL: Correct, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I . . . to the honourable member. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as I was attempting to quote an article of - I believe this is the Winnipeg Free Press about two weeks ago; "The Manitoba Association of Social Workers has blasted the Provincial Government for its failure to rectify inadequate facilities and staff to deal with juvenile offenders in Winnipeg." Well of course this is juvenile offenders.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interfere - it's a wonderful speech; but wouldn't this be a better item to discuss under the Attorney-General's Department in view of the fact that he has corrections and penal institutions?

MR. USKIW: I think I'm relating it to the problem of putting 10 year olds into the institutions, into the jails, Mr. Chairman, so I don't think I'm departing from the subject matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . member's remarks in the confusion we had in the committee for a few moments, and I would ask the honourable member to stay with the Department of Welfare.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I am staying within that jurisdiction because the article that I'm quoting goes on to say, "Social Workers have seen as many as 50 children in these detention centres." This is my point, and I'm only suggesting that this government has a responsibility in providing the necessary accommodation, the necessary facilities for these type of children, children that come under the Children's Aid Society and so forth. This is my point and I'm sure it's well taken by the Honourable Minister, so I hope in closing, Mr. Chairman, that this government does bend backwards a bit and give it some consideration and let's establish some temporary receiving homes for these type of situations. I think it's wrong that these children in those age groups should be placed in the regular detention home. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Welfare.

MR. CARROLL: I'm wondering if I could just take a moment to comment on some of the things that have been said here this afternoon.

To begin with, the Member for Brokenhead I think might well make his representations to the former Member for Brokenhead to have the Disability Allowance regulations changed in the House of Commons in order that we may change the policy under which we have to consider disability applications. I think this is where one of the real confusions lies. The Disability Allowance program, the Blind Persons Allowances, Old Age Assistance, are programs that are administered by the Province of Manitoba under legislation established by the Government of Canada and under regulations dictated by them. We have had to bring in complementary legislation here but the rules are actually made in Ottawa, and for a person to qualify for a Disability Allowance he has to, as I understand it, require the constant care and attention of another person, which means he has to be pretty severely disabled before he can qualify under the tests of that particular statute. However, in the one case he mentioned in particular, he was able to get satisfaction under the Social Allowances Act.

I must confess I agree with him completely on the fact that the man should have been referred to the other department administering the Social Allowances Act. I've tried to establish a policy in my own office that a person who comes to us for assistance who doesn't meet any of the programs that we have, that we try to direct him and try to make sure that he gets to the agency that may in fact be able to handle his particular case. And I think this is where most of the problem has arisen with respect to the points that he raised there.

In connection with the Member for Selkirk on desertions and so on; at one time prior to 1961 all cases of adoption by parents' own children, the mother who has a child, she remarries where the father then wants to adopt the child, it was obligatory on the department to make a report with respect to that adoption home. We changed the statute in 1961 so that this would not be compulsory but that it was discretionary with the judge of the Country Court to whom this application was made in the adoption proceedings, and the judge, possibly in a contested case or under whatever circumstances he deems advisable may, in those cases, order the Director of Welfare to make a report with respect to that case. So that this is discretionary with the judge himself. We have changed the statute so that we don't have to make these reports with respect to parents' own adoptions.

There is also under the Child Welfare Act a provision to be able to waive the \$25.00 fee in cases of real hardship and I understand that this is used in some cases.

Now with respect to the deserted mothers who are unable to get maintenance support from husbands, we have made certain changes in the administrative procedure affecting this; we have directed our regional offices to give, first of all, counsel and advice to mothers who present themselves and who are in difficulties of this kind. We direct them to free legal advice where that is available. If the action is to proceed in court where there is no free legal advice available, then the department has on occasion provided it. We understand that this is one of the provisions in the new code that will be considered by committee in the next few months.

Even if all of the maintenance orders were paid, I think we'd still have a problem because my understanding is that most maintenance orders are inadequate to support the mother and her family. Partly because of that we reduced the age at which deserted mothers could be considered for assistance under the Social Allowances Act to four years initially and then subsequently to one year, and after the first of April this year we will be handling all Mothers Allowance cases involving one year or more of desertion. We're also beefing up the service with respect to maintenance orders. A new staff member is being employed whose full-time job will be trying to enforce maintenance orders and to assist with the prosecutions of husbands who may desert. So I think there is some better service being given to deserted mothers than

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)...has been available in the past. However, we must confess that there are still some problems in this area. I regret that our department wasn't advised of the Minus-One Conference that was held recently. I'm sure that we would have wanted to attend had we known that that was taking place.

The Member for Inkster raises another point that I will ask our department to give consideration to. It appears to be a legal technical point on which I really can't make comment at this time.

The Member for Portage la Prairie, he raised a very interesting point and read a speech that I'm sure members of the House found extremely interesting. Frankly I'm not particularly interested in the policies of the federal Liberal Government. We are certainly interested in the effects of those policies on our government here. He did point out to the House that the Leader of the New Democratic Party was right when he said this was a means test. However it's a qualified means test. It's a means test without looking into the nooks and crannies. It's a means test with no snooping or prying. --(Interjection)-- That's what the Member for Portage la Prairie said.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, yeah, but....

MR. CARROLL: It's a qualified means test. I say it's an honour system - that's what I choose to call it. It's still a means test; it's still a means test. You were right.

I think the burden of my comments this morning was that I was interested in finding out what the policy of the Official Opposition was in this House to the various welfare programs, and the only reason I mentioned this specific item was that several of the candidates representing their party in the last election were strongly opposed to this particular scheme, and I did just want to draw attention to that at the time of my estimates.

Now the Member for Lakeside was talking about uniformity and the fact that we have 50 new private voluntary agencies in the metropolitan area, and that we have very few new methods of co-ordinating these services. As the members of the House know, the services of the private voluntary agencies in this area are more or less under the jurisdiction of the Community Welfare Planning Council, partly, too, under the control or financial control of the United Way, and I think that we don't want to deny here the rights of individuals who see need and who organize themselves for whatever need they want, to try and meet that need. The Member for St. Vital mentioned a while ago about certain church groups that were organizing to provide day centre care. I don't think anyone would want to deny the right of a church group to get together for that purpose, and this is the kind of thing that's being referred to in this little booklet here and is being presented here as some lack of co-ordination for which we as a provincial government should share responsibility.

Where do we go from here in welfare expenditures? I don't know whether we need comment on that. I think it's pretty obvious the way Hospital Commission prices have gone. We're paying out this year \$11 million to the elderly or thereabouts - \$10,300,000 to help the elderly, which was not being paid in 1958 or 1957 because this was not part of the provincial program at that time. We're paying out \$12 million with respect to Child Welfare and Mothers Allowance and I don't think anybody wants to deny this kind of support to people like that in need. The figures about ward maintenance were drawn to our attention. What is a ward? It's a person who's committed by the courts to the care of a child-caring agency, the Children's Aid Society, because he's been abused or he's been neglected by his parents, or because he's orphaned or for some other reason. We don't surely seriously put forward the proposition that we should be denying support to that group, and of course we have to live within the costs dictated by what we have to pay for services to our very dedicated foster parent groups in the metropolitan area - doing a very valuable service.

Incidentally, there's the business of work activity programs that was announced or mentioned in a speech by the Honourable Obie Baizley. This is a program that was supported by the Government of Manitoba, I believe last year. It's on my estimates and I'm not sure, I probably read into the record at that time - if I didn't I could do so now - the position that was taken by the Manitoba Government to the Dominion-Provincial Conference of Welfare Ministers in which we said that we want the Canada Assistance Plan to take care of this sort of situation where we can put inadequate people to work to try to build up their ability to work, their skill, so that they may become fully independent and self-employed. Now, we mentioned the other day that the regulations had just come out under the Canada Assistance Plan, and do you know the one item that has no regulations covered there? It's the work activity program. The government in Ottawa hasn't seen fit yet, as one of their priorities, to make regulations with

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....respect to this program. Once it does, I want to assure you that we're going to take maximum advantage of this because we, as a government, believe in that program; we told the Federal Government that we believe in that program; it's received publicity in our papers here in Manitoba, and I'd be very pleased to elaborate on that at our next sitting if that's the wish of the House.

MR. USKIW: .....clear the air here. The Honourable Minister assumed that I wasn't aware of the fact that these are reciprocal agreements, federal-provincial, that we're dealing with, when we're talking about moneys expended to the Department of Welfare. I want to point out that I was fully aware; I was merely suggesting that we could supplement provincially. And the other point was the question of providing facilities for child offenders.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I think there would be fairly unanimous agreement if I were to move at the present time that the Committee rise.

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

A MEMBER: I hope he doesn't come in in uniform.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, noticing as I make the motion the two new additions we have to the House in buckskin, I am pleased to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 on Monday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the house adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.