



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



INDEX

Thursday, July 23rd, 1959

<u>Bill 81</u> , re Child Welfare Act (Mr. Lyon) Introduction	1243
<u>Bill 95</u> , re Law of Property Act (Mr. Lyon) Introduction	1243
<u>Questions</u>	1243

Third Readings

<u>Bill 59</u> , re M.H.S.A. (Mr. Johnson, Gimli): Mr. Paulley, Mr. Johnson (Gimli) Mr. Campbell....	1244
Mr. Ridley, Mr. Paulley	1245
Mr. Johnson (Gimli)	1246
Mr. Orlikow	1247
Mr. Gray	1248
<u>Bills 61, 62, 65, 85</u>	1248
<u>Bill 24</u> , re Housing Elderly Persons (Mr. Johnson, Gimli) 2nd Reading	1248
Mr. Gray, Mr. Orlikow	1249
Mr. Wright, Mr. Cowan	1250
Mr. Johnson (Gimli).....	1252

Committee of Supply

<u>Health and Public Welfare, Welfare Division, Statement, Mr. Johnson (Gimli)</u>	1254
Discussion of Statement	1255
Social Allowances	1260
Alcoholism Rehabilitation	1267
<u>Industry and Commerce, Statement, Mr. Evans</u>	1275
Discussion of Statement.....	1281
Travel and Publicity	1291
Grant to Transportation Commission	1291
<u>Salary Increases, Statement, Mr. Roblin</u>	1292

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, July 23rd, 1959

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 81, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act No. 2, and that same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that leave be given to introduce the Bill No. 95, an Act to amend the Law of Property Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct a few questions to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. The first question is, how far does the government intend to proceed with the dividing strip on PTH No. 9 from the Selkirk by-pass south? Do you want to answer each question as I ask it?

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q. C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration) (Turtle Mountain): The strip is an experiment. We don't intend to proceed any further than now -- to try it now. We're going to paint it a bright color, see how it works out, and then decide whether we will continue it or not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question then. Are you going to make openings in that strip similar to the openings that you have on the double white strips now. Coming along there this morning I noticed that some strips were about 1,000 feet long and people on the east side of that highway who work in Winnipeg, have to travel north, to the first opening north in order to come south, and there's considerable hard feeling over it. So would it be your policy to make openings in those strips at the same places as your openings are now in the double white line? You have an opening opposite each dwelling house which has a crossing.

MR. WILLIS: I couldn't say in regard to each individual opening without examining it on the ground, but certainly there will be openings where openings are necessary. The hazard is increased greatly if we have openings in regard to each householder along the highway, and that is not possible -- but openings where openings are necessary. The member called to our attention an additional opening about two weeks ago which was arranged for and in general we will just make them where necessary but there won't be any undue trouble as far as the householders are concerned. But they will not each have one; safety is the first consideration, and we can't accommodate everyone, but safety is the first consideration and where necessary we'll have openings.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the government then consider opening a temporary office down in that direction to receive complaints, because I don't consider that I'm under any obligation to support government policy.

MR. WILLIS: As a member I've always thought that was what I was paid for.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. HILLHOUSE: And I'm responsible for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. G. JOHNSON, M. D. (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following bills: No. 59; 61; 62; 65 and 85.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and requested the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 59.

MR. A. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I would move that the Committee not consider Bill 59, but refer it back to the Committee on Law Amendments due to the representations which were heard this morning.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, concerning Bill No. 59, I do not share the view of the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party. I think it was made very abundantly clear by the speakers today that this is a very concrete proposal, that is the return of the Blue Cross money to those who should apply, that the administrative red tape, time and many difficulties which would be encountered in returning this money, as Blue Cross pointed out, would more than -- would be a very ineffective move. I do feel too that, as the person and the Minister who brought down this Bill, that at all times the welfare of the people of the province has certainly been uppermost in our minds. There's no intent by this Bill to funnel monies into the coffers of the government. This is purely a concrete suggestion which, I understood, was agreed upon in principle by all those whom I called in to discuss this matter with. I feel the representations this morning only convinced me further that the method of distribution as outlined in this Bill, was the more preferable course to take. Certainly there is no one in the House who wants to deprive an individual who may wish their prorata share returned, this privilege; that is spelled out only too clearly. And I feel myself very definitely that the Bill should be allowed to proceed through third reading.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this motion will probably be pressed to a vote, I would like to mention the stand that I take personally with regard to it. I think that the Minister has stated quite correctly the situation as I see it. No. 1. I was in favour as the House was of having the Bill stand in Committee until the folks who wished to had the opportunity of making further representation. Those representations have been made. I don't see any point in the Bill going back to Law Amendments Committee because apparently everyone who has wanted to make representation, has already done so. Now, I'm certainly not against all the discussion that the honourable members want to take part in being allowed here, but now that we're in Committee of the Whole there can be a full discussion, not only of all the members of Law Amendments Committee, but of all of those who are not members of Law Amendments Committee. And all the arguments that can be -- could be raised in the Committee can be raised here, discussed here, with an even fuller representation of the House than we have on that Committee.

So while I can appreciate the very valid reasons that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party had for asking the Bill to stand at the time he made that request, the arrangements have been made to accommodate that situation, the presentations have been made, they were gone into quite fully so far as representations were made, and we are now in the position I think for each and everyone of us to have our minds made up and discuss the matter to our hearts content here. And I'm all in favour of that being done. And I'll be quite willing to state my own position on the merits of the Bill itself when that comes up, but I do not see any reason for it going back to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Chairman presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 1 (a)(c), (c i), (c ii). Sub-section (B) 2, (2 a), (2 b), 3 - 4 - 5 - 6. Section 1 Pass. Section 2 Pass.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a comment. We've gone through that so rapidly we haven't had time to present any formal amendments at this stage to the Bill. As you know, we worked until 1:00 o'clock in the Committee. I also realize that I don't think that we'd get very far with any further suggestions than was made this morning. So let it be clearly understood that that is the reason that I haven't raised any question on the various items of the Bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would wish to say only that while I realize the difficulty of disposing of a fund of this kind and while I was quite in favour of the Bill as it was passed last year, I was in favour of it at that time because quite frankly the majority of the people on the Committee who had given considerable attention to this matter seemed to think that that was the best way, taking everybody's interest into account, to deal with the situation.

Now, I must say quite frankly, that it seems to me that in the interval there have been

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . some second thought given to this matter and in my opinion this is a better disposition than we had before. I know that it would be the feeling I think of most of us, perhaps all of us, that if it were reasonably possible to give the money back to the individuals without a great deal of expense and difficulty, that that would perhaps be theoretically the best thing to do with it. But having had considerable experience over quite a lot of years with the difficulty of getting that kind of a program implemented, I think that this is a good compromise. Now it's true that this does not seek out everyone and place the money that rightly belongs to that person in that person's hand. But on the other hand it certainly does make provision for anyone who sees the advertisement or has been interested in the discussions that have gone on, who will take the trouble to apply for getting his or her money. And I think that that is a reasonable disposition of the matter. I realize that there will be some who will not get their money.

I recall the situation that existed a good many years ago, 30 years ago, at the time of the winding up of the first Wheat Board, back at the time just following World War I. And even though the producers -- and farmers are not noted for having too much money as a rule, -- even though the producers in that case held a certificate which had always been pointed out to them as being likely to be a valuable certificate, and every producer had had that certificate sent to him, they had that certificate to remind them of the necessity of asking for their money at the completion of the Wheat Board operations. The fact was, and it turned out, that that certificate was worth almost 50¢ per bushel. But in spite of that a great many people in Manitoba and many more, as you would guess, in the other two prairie provinces, never cashed their certificates. And six years later, or thereabouts, there was standing in that fund a very large amount of money unallocated. And as some of the honourable members know, it was eventually paid out to the three different governments, and the Wheat Board Money Trust Act was put on the statute books here in this province. Manitoba's share being something in the neighborhood of \$128,000. for something where the producers had held a certificate to remind them of the fact that they had a potential earning in that fund.

Now I realize that it's unlikely that all of the people, or even perhaps the largest portion of them, will claim the money that justly belongs to them, and I know that someone will feel some people will feel, that additional measures should be taken to search them out, but I think that the difficulty and expense of doing that outweighs the advantages of getting a reasonable compromise such as this, and I think that the Minister made a good effort to try and get the people interested to agree to a proposal that he was trying to make seems to me it's the best compromise that we could get under these circumstances and it's better to get along with it.

MR. M. E. RIDLEY (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I will be very pleased to see this Bill passed and go through as I have been a patient at the Cancer Clinic for the last four months at the Forlong Clinic in the General Hospital, and during that time I have received very good attention. They put through there from one hundred to one hundred and ten patients a day and their facilities are just terrible. There is six booths in there in the one place, there's no place for people to change their clothes. One Wednesday when I was there it was raining and the roof was leaking, but as far as the care you get from the nurses and the doctors it's just wonderful. I went out to pay my bill and they said there was no charge from the doctors, Dr. Israels and Dr. Walton and I am sure that we are doing a great service to the whole Province of Manitoba by giving them this money to help build their facilities so they can handle this run of people. And I'll be very pleased if this Bill is passed and I'm sure we're doing a great service to everyone.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to say anything further in connection with this Bill, but I don't want any misconception of the viewpoint taken by those who were at the Law Amendments Committee this morning or ourselves in respect of the treatment of cancer. We realize, and we've tried to impress upon this House not only this year, but in former years as well, without avail, the necessity for governmental action in respect of free treatment of cancer. Now the honourable member, who has just taken his seat, has informed us that he was informed that the treatments that he has received were without cost to him. Such does not apply to all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba, and all that we have said in respect of this are two things. First of all, because of the fact that the monies that are being disposed of by this resolution were amassed as the result of the contributions made by members or subscribers to Blue Cross; that the basic principle should be that it should be returned to them and that was

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . the basic principle in the Bill of last year. And secondly to that, while having no objection if deemed by the subscriber for this amount of money to go into cancer research, representation has been made and suggested that if that amount of money is done it should form the basis of free cancer treatment to all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. What is being done in this, and I have no objections to it at all, is to form the basis of the building of a building for Research of Cancer -- all right -- research and treatment. The building is for research and treatment. But the point raised is simply this, that having been done there is no provision for the free treatment of cancer. And we maintain and it has been maintained, that because this amount of money was subscribed by a relatively few or great, it doesn't matter, but they were done on an individual basis rather than a governmental basis, that if it goes into that field it should apply to all of the province on a free treatment basis. And secondly to that, the other objection in respect of the Bill, was the method of approach to the subscriber.

And when I spoke on this Bill on second reading I suggested that there would be no opposition whatsoever to a circular going to the known subscribers saying to them, "Now we would like this money to go in for the purposes of Cancer Research and Treatment" -- if you want me to add the words I have no objection to it at all -- "But on the other hand if you would rather get your money back you can." It was on the question of the approach, that I raised the question. And I pointed out at that time, that in many instances in respect of advertisements in paper people just simply don't pay attention to them. And we thought that a far better method would be the direct approach to the individual subscriber. And those were the objections that were raised to it. And we say this, and we say it again, and we're going to continue to say it in this House as I mentioned before, that we're going to continue to press until this government or this province recognizes what in our opinion, is its responsibilities in respect of the treatment of cancer by the provision of free cancer treatment in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I want to answer two questions here. One is the Cancer Foundation and Research Foundation. As I tried to point out in my estimates the Cancer Foundation in Manitoba is the treatment-arm of cancer in the province and the Canadian Cancer Society through its national body collects the funds from across the Dominion for research and then funnels back the amounts of money required for research in this province from this central source, to prevent duplication of Cancer Research. In other words you don't want every city in the Dominion of Canada on the same research project across the land, you want a diversification -- and our society has ample representation on that Research Committee. It was the intention and it was at all times made perfectly clear to those bodies whom I met with in trying to find some more suitable distribution for the Blue Cross Fund -- for some real purpose for them -- that this would be entirely in the use for the construction of a facility for the treatment of cancer. Certainly the province would contribute the construction grants that were available through our federal grants in assisting the Cancer Foundation, or the Cancer Foundation to construct this facility. But here was something that everyone who had ever subscribed to Blue Cross could look to and say "This is what our money built in the City of Winnipeg -- a Cancer Treatment Foundation -- we got the thing going". The Government has told you that we are going to carry this in perpetuity, we are largely, practically carrying that entire operation at this time, and will continue to do so. In that facility there will be radium, there will be the Cobalt bomb, there would be other high energy equipment for treating more difficult and more inaccessible types of cancer. This was the whole object of this exercise. Here was something that the people of Manitoba could look on for many years to come as a very worthwhile effort. It is the opinion of, by far, and only from this group have I heard the reservation that this is not the proper method of disposal; the people who are charged now with the responsibility of returning that money as indicated this morning very adequately in committee are most concerned as to the efficiency with which they will be able to do their job in the manner suggested by the Leader of the CCF Party.

Now as far as free cancer treatment goes, I think that we should say a few words in this respect. I indicated previously in my estimates that I did not feel, per se, the treatment of cancer should be any more different as for free treatment as is hypertension. There is no one in the Province of Manitoba today who needs necessary cancer surgery that doesn't get that surgery performed. There is no way this government or any government can pay for that in total. I also say this that here we're offering free radiation. This is a radiation centre -- this is where medication for cancer will be given. Nitrogen and this whole array of new drugs that are

(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . now in use in leukemias and what not. All forms of it can be centralized in this place. There is no where else outside the City of Winnipeg where radium and cobalt therapy and so on can be given. We cannot afford, as a province, to duplicate Cobalt bombs in every nook and cranny of this Province; we have to start centralizing these very high cost facilities.

I make a plea here that we build a Cancer Foundation Treatment Centre in the City of Winnipeg; that we use what monies from the Blue Cross that the people do not wish returned; that we the government, join with this group in constructing this facility; that we offer these services to the people of Manitoba and to the doctors of this Province, and this government is quite prepared, as I've said before and I'll say again, in our time, and before too long we hope, join with the professions in meeting the needs of those who cannot afford high cost medical operative care and so on. None of us in this House want to see these people deprived of essential medical and surgical service. I agree -- this is what I want to get through -- I agree whole heartedly that we must meet this need. I also agree that in the past, and I think you will all have to agree with me, that the medical profession of this province has measured up to it in doing this service. But people have come to their way of thinking that they no longer want to feel as second-class citizens; they no longer want to feel that their doctor is doing them a big favour; they want to feel that they're paying their way. And this is what we intend to do with those people who are not able to pay their way. We want to give them this independence of mind and spirit; but also we want to see this money properly used in the construction of this facility. We will go, we have said we will keep it in perpetuity, and those aren't so many words, that's what we've reiterated over and over again, and we will. But, here was the problem, many, many representations came in; there's got to be something concrete done with this money. Everyone agreed this was a dandy idea, but it's just this disposal of funds that we're arguing about, what's the best way to do it? The best people in this field tell us the way this Act is written is probably the most practical. We're not trying to deprive the rights of anyone, but I think it's time we stood up and were counted on this Bill now. I think let's get ahead with this job of building this cancer facility for the Province of Manitoba. (Hear! Hear!).

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): We on this side are certainly are not opposed to the building of all the facilities, which are needed for the treatment of cancer, and with the statement of the Minister that people don't want to be treated as second-class citizens; don't want somebody to give them charity in the treatment of cancer, we certainly couldn't agree more. This is not the issue about which the discussion is being held at all. The point, Mr. Chairman, is a simple one, this, the Blue Cross was a voluntary organization set up to help finance the hospital costs of the people who participated. The assets of the Blue Cross belong to those people. I'm not opposed to the use of this money or any other money for the facilities which are being proposed. I certainly have no intention of asking for my amount of money whether it's \$1.75 as has been suggested by the representatives of the Blue Cross, or \$15.00 as suggested by one of the labour representatives this morning. But the point is that a good number of people, who belong to Blue Cross, feel that this is their money and that they are entitled to get it back. I've had more 'phone calls about this matter, than I think any other matter which has come up -- which I've had anything to do with in the last two or three years. People feel very strongly that this is their money and that they ought to be entitled to get it back. Now the Minister says and a representative of the Blue Cross -- just a second -- the Minister said and a representative of the Blue Cross said this morning that they were doing everything possible to get it back to the people. The representations made this morning, and I have to agree with them, were that advertising will not get the message across -- and if I listened correctly to the Leader of the Opposition he agreed that you wouldn't get it all back -- and the representations made this morning and the suggestions we have made is that there ought to be a much more intensive attempt made to notify the subscribers of Blue Cross as to what their rights are. I know it's difficult -- I know it will cost money but I said this morning, and I say it again, it's no more difficult and no more expensive than it was when they had to notify the subscribers that the rates were going up, or that they would be cut off because they didn't meet the requirements any more. And this can be done, and I think it should be done before the balance of the money is used for this purpose. For which we have no objection, we certainly support this or any other proposal to provide better facilities for cancer treatment.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, just one minute. I expressed my views on second reading that all the money should go for cancer research or for cancer cures; and at that time I expressed my opinion that the public are human, and they will be no objection at all. And I venture to say, the little I know of human nature, and being a member of a prothetic race, I don't think you'll get -- you'll get less than a hundred, much less than a hundred who will ask for their money back. I think the present Bill . . . (Interjection) . . . pardon? . . . and so I, but this present Bill gives them the right to ask for it, and I think it's well worded, and anything we can do to save at least a human life, one human life, from this serious disease which is now prevailing -- and it spreads, I think it's our duty to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported -- Pass. Bills No. 61, 62, 65 and 85 were each read section by section and passed.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): The Committee of the Whole has considered Bills No. 59, 61, 62, 65 and 85 and directed me to report the same without amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture that Bill No. 59 - an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Manitoba Hospital Service Association, be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one comment. We felt that we had a duty to perform in raising the objections as to the distribution of the funds of the Blue Cross. Having raised those objections I want to assure the House we have no objections and are not going to oppose the third reading of this Bill.

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

Bills No. 61, 62, 65 and 85 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities for second reading of Bill No. 74. The Honourable Leader of the CCF.

MR. PAULLEY; Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to allow this to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Second reading of Bill No. 24. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the -- Oh, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Bill No. 24, an Act respecting Housing Accommodation for Elderly Persons be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the question.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle of this Bill, I'd like to say that the principle of the Act itself is to provide greater provincial aid to elderly persons' housing in the light of our experience. There is a great need for such legislation in Manitoba today. In the past few months many organizations and municipalities have approached us concerning increased government participation in this field of elderly persons' housing. Now we have studied the problem quite thoroughly and have had numerous discussions with voluntary organizations, church groups, other charitable groups, welfare people, municipal men and the Age and Opportunity Bureau of Manitoba. We have seen other western provinces going ahead by leaps and bounds. I feel mainly because of good salesmanship and by more generous grants structure. Organizations and municipalities want to build hostels without the set proportions of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation regulations. This Bill provides increased grants for diversified programs for elderly persons' housing units and hostel accommodation, single units, double units and certain facilities which may be shared are provided for. A great need for more single accommodation is required, and the grants are realistic by modern day housing costs.

In respect to hostels, the restrictions of the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation have prevented the development of this type of accommodation to date, and this Bill lifts such restrictions by providing for Provincial Government guarantee of loans for such accommodation; and again, diversifies the program by providing that such hostels are not tied to a housing

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . development. In the hostel type of development experience shows that a certain number of infirm beds are always a necessity. Provision is made for a certain number of these beds to be permissible in the construction of a hostel. We intend, Mr. Speaker, to promote this scheme and a full time director of elderly persons' housing is essential to present a diversified program to those many groups, so that interest in such housing may be stimulated and to give leadership in this field. Supervision and advisory services are essential. Provision is made in the Act for licensing of such premises which we feel must be kept to a very high standard. I think members of the House would ask ourselves, how is this Elderly Persons' Housing Act, or how does it compare with the previous legislation. 1) The province itself will guarantee the loan where necessary. This achieves greater diversification of development. 2) It stimulates voluntary groups and non-charitable groups and municipalities to develop elderly persons' housing for as little as 10% of the total cost to them initially. 3) It provides that such accommodation is 43 1/3% donated, that is by government and group, upon completion, and this in turn lowers rents. 4) It meets the needs of the single group or the single people in the age group, of which there are so many at that age. 5) It provides for infirm beds in hostels if desired; and 6) It raises income ceilings to five times the rental, less services, over the former provision of the Old Age Assistance ceiling of \$960 and \$1620

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, in principle, I'm not opposed to the Bill. Anything that's being done for the elderly people is very welcome, but I was just thinking -- and I'm not trying to oppose the Bill -- is whether for the elderly people it would be more advisable to build institutions, rather than individual housing. First of all, in an institution they could have medical attention, nursing attention, social welfare attention, some amusement; they could probably carry on with their religions and particularly those, and there are many of them, who cannot help themselves and it would be difficult for them to ask for help in case of certain emergencies. Now I realize that the construction of the buildings would be very heavy, costly, but at the same time I think it's a permanent institution. It could be if necessary, be built, although I do not believe in a melting pot, but I also do not believe in too much of segregation, but at the same time for the elderly people religion means quite a bit. This is the only thing they live on and it's very dear to them, and facilities could now only be given in a larger institution. The experience I've had with one institution in the city, I find that everyone there is quite happy, they have a synagogue; they have a recreation room; they have television; they have radio; people come to entertain them, quite a few artists who come to Winnipeg visit them, and their life is made much happier than otherwise is. Most of the old people haven't got their children around them, perhaps not even in the city or not in the province, but far away. The children may not be able to come around visiting them all the time and they are lonesome, isolated, even in good homes. So I think perhaps some consideration -- while adopting this -- some consideration should be given by the government if at all possible, at least for the majority of the old and aged, for the senior citizens, to build for them institutions where their lives could be made much easier, happier and I think they could get their subsistence for less than it would cost them to be by themselves. So while I'm not discussing the details of this Bill, but I thought perhaps I would suggest this principle of building institutions rather than individual homes, or both. But the final solution in my opinion is, well run under government supervision, institutions; and I think the government has a perfect right to supervise it because they are making some grants to them. I just respectfully suggest this, not instead of this Bill, because the other proposition may take some time to implement, but you should have it in mind while approving the Bill as it is now.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, there is hardly a member who represents any of the urban constituencies who would not give hearty endorsement to the principles enunciated in this Bill, because there are very few constituencies in Greater Winnipeg or in any of the other urban areas in which the housing accommodations for a fairly large number of the people, not only elderly people, but all people, but certainly for a very large percentage of the elderly people, is far below any standards which we could accept as being adequate. I'm glad to know that in this Bill the housing accommodations which will be built under the provisions of this Bill will be licensed and be supervised as to their standards. I wish that all housing accommodations of old people, not only those who will be in these buildings, would be licensed and supervised, because some of the conditions under which people in this city -- and I think the same is true in St. Boniface, the same is true in Brandon and I think the same is true in The Pas -- some of the conditions

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . under which the elderly people are living are a disgrace to a modern society which we claim to be. So we certainly have no objection, indeed we greet with approval this proposal. I for one am happy to see the government announce in the Bill that it is ready to provide, and without going into detail, about approximately a third of the cost of building these accommodations. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, and possibly the Minister's going to handle this in the capital account, but I would like to get some idea of what program, what objective the government is setting for the building of this type of accommodation. I had it with me, but I couldn't find it to bring it into the House today, a summary of what is being done in Saskatchewan. Now I don't know whether the Saskatchewan Bill is as good as this Bill, or better than this Bill, or worse; and that's not important as far as I'm concerned, what is important is what we do with the Bill. And as I remember the figures that I saw for Saskatchewan, they have built, and I'm speaking from memory only, they have built over 3,000 units for elderly people since they began their program. And I would like to know from the Minister, either today or possibly if he prefers to leave it till the capital discussion, I would like to know what plans the government has, what amount of money they think will be required say each year for the next five years, and how many units they are setting as an objective that will be built, not by the government, but as this Bill proposes, through the co-operation of voluntary, charitable, private, municipal and any other organizations which are going to participate in this program.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, like my honourable colleague I rise to say that we're very happy that this Bill should be presented at this time. It fills a long -- much needed gap. I would just like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to digress a moment from the Bill itself to senior citizens' housing in general.

In the Municipality of West Kildonan we have one of the finest Senior Citizens' Housing Developments in Manitoba. Most of the credit for this goes for Mr. Anatole Bosenko, a new Canadian, who in order to show his appreciation for our way of life, wanted to do something to make life a little more comfortable for our senior citizens. Mr. Bosenko put up 10% of the total cost of this large development, built himself a home across the street, so that he might be close to the project in which he is so interested; and after watching the project for some time, he saw the need for accommodation for single persons. These couples lived there in happiness and should one of the partners die, it means that they have to leave their friends and the district which they have become so attached. He is now constructing a fine building across the street which will have single suites to fill this need. Now the rents for the suites for the married couples are \$45. a month, and of course as we all know, this is on a Central Mortgage basis whereby they had put up 90% of the money, and from this \$45. per month is kept an amount for the maintenance of grounds, etc. Now the maintenance of the building is a problem because although the halls, etc. are the responsibility of the promoter, it has been necessary from time to time to give assistance - because of ill health -- to give assistance to these people to maintain their suites in the fine condition they wish to keep them. In talking with Mr. Bosenko about senior citizens' housing in general, he pointed out that while he is very happy to have been the means of promoting this project there, he was wondering whether or not the government could give some consideration to the supplying of appliances to these elderly people, so that they might be able to take advantage of all the modern ways of making it easier to keep their suites in fine condition.

There also is the concern of the municipality of course, in regard to the residence qualifications for these tenants of senior citizens' housing, and although the Social Allowances Bill no doubt take care of much of the need, it seems to me that because one community is more desirable, and because it has the type of citizen who would promote this type of venture, it seems to me that this community should not be penalized because of their interest in this type of development. And I would urge the government to look into the matter of assuming responsibility for the residence of people where it can be shown that one municipality is carrying the load more than others in this regard.

MR. J. COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to see this housing legislation. I have had the opportunity of seeing the housing conditions under which many of our old people live, for I had the opportunity to look after the construction of Canadian Legion Gardens built by the Canadian Legion for forty elderly low-income couples and I still -- I'm the

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . president of the organization and manage the project. I've seen the need for this accommodation, and particularly the need for single people, because we have far more single elderly low-income persons than we have married couples. And I am pleased to see too, that the legislation has been changed somewhat from what it was formerly; it will now permit for instance persons of 60 to 65 years of age to obtain help in these suites. We found a number of people who had strokes or who had very high, bad heart conditions, that were about 60 years of age, and under the former legislation they weren't eligible for suites; whereas they will be eligible with the consent of the Minister in the housing accommodation built under this Act. And I'm very pleased too, to see the additional money help from the Provincial Government and the fact that they are going to employ a person to give leadership in this construction work. It is a great deal of work -- a great deal of work has to be done by any organization and the people in it, and the fact that the government is going to provide some help will mean a great deal to groups. I know that in St. James Kiwanis, they built a wonderful project, but at times those that were sponsoring it just about felt like giving up because of the various troubles and because they didn't have anyone that they could go to for help, like they will have, but then the Provincial Government hires their Director. This program too, will be helped I'm sure in cases where we can't get the rents low enough, by grants under our new Social Allowances Act.

In Saskatchewan they had to strictly comply with the federal requirements if they wished to build a hostel type of accommodation, which requires that for every person that was put in the hostel type of accommodation, the organization had to build accommodation for two people in self-contained suites; and the result is that they built in the rural parts of Saskatchewan, more self-contained suites than they needed. In Kamsack they actually weren't able to find enough elderly persons for the suites and they rented them to others. And this is going to be a great advantage over that scheme to have our scheme where there will be no restrictions like that, and where the Provincial Government can guarantee hostels -- the mortgages on hostels, without relationship to the number that are accommodated in self-contained suites. And this Act too -- the Honourable Member for Inkster says -- we should make provision for building institutions -- and this Act does make provision for building institutions if that type of housing is desired; but I submit, Mr. Speaker, this Act makes provision for a new type of housing, not built with government help in any other part of Canada which will be of great assistance to our elderly people in Manitoba; and that is that this Act makes provision for the construction of housing accommodation which is not self-contained for elderly single people, where the elderly single people would share a lounge and share bathroom and toilet facilities; and this will have the effect of bringing down the cost; and this will have the effect of helping to reduce two of the greatest problems of old age, which are idleness and loneliness.

In England where they've had a great deal more experience along this line than in Canada, we find that in December 1956 they started giving encouragement, giving subsidies to a new type of accommodation which they called "flatlets", where the elderly single person was rented accommodation in a fairly large building where the kitchen facilities were provided, and where they shared a lounge and shared bathroom and toilet facilities; and in this way the elderly person had something to do. They had their own shopping to do; they had their own cooking to do; they had their own rooms to look after; and they could bring their own furniture and pieces of china and pictures into their own room. Now these are all very important to our older people, and this is -- these things are not available in most of our institutions in this city, where they provide everything for them; they provide the meals; they do the cooking. I was in a large one in Hamilton, Ontario recently, built just like a palace, and the old people were sitting around there just as though they were waiting to die, because they had nothing to do, but this type of accommodation, these 'flatlets' as they're called in the old country gives these older people something to do; it enables them to live a life in a more natural way than in an institution; and it has been found in England that it is the better type of accommodation to promote for older people who are still able to look after themselves. It is important because it overcomes those two problems of loneliness and idleness, and so in this Act which is -- there is provision for building that type of accommodation and this is something that is not available in any other province of Canada with government help. So I think we will go forward and lead other provinces in that respect.

As a matter of fact the survey that was recently made by the Urban Renewal Board of

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) South Point Douglas recommended that such accommodation should be built for the single elderly people in that area; and of course that type of accommodation where they share some facilities is much cheaper to construct and operate than are self-contained suites. If you build self-contained suites for elderly persons even with all the government help that is now provided, about the cheapest you can rent them is \$40.00 a month; whereas if they share some of these facilities, you will be able to reduce the rent considerably and so make them available to a greater number of people, specially those with the lowest of incomes. This additional help for housing, I am sure, is going to help the conditions in our nursing homes and in our hospitals. I know that there are some people in our nursing homes who do not require nursing home care, but they have no place to go to; they have no place where they can look after themselves and do their own cooking and so on, and some of them are having to stay in those institutions for that reason. And I know over at Princess Elizabeth some of them, the older people are given quite a lot of physiotherapy, and they are brought back to a pretty good state of health and then they have to get out, and they find unfortunately that they haven't got a place to go to where they can look after themselves -- a decent place, and they are soon back in hospital again and all the time and money that was spent on them with regard to physiotherapy treatments has been wasted. So we will provide housing accommodation which will certainly be of great value in many, many ways. There is one thing and that is that this housing accommodation is to a large extent dependent upon organizations and municipalities initiating the schemes. Now we all are residents in one municipality or another and we and our wives all belong to various organizations, and I would hope that each of the members of this House would not go back to their constituencies and think of it being necessary for other organizations to build these institutions, or build this housing; but that each of us would go to our own organization whether it be a trade union, or a legion branch, or a service club, or a church, and try within our own organization to try and promote these housing developments, so that we will better the conditions of our old people in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is closing the debate.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate I'll be very brief. I just want to bring a few points to the attention of members and try and answer some questions which were asked in a very co-operative manner. The whole object of this Bill, as expressed by the honourable -- I'd like to point out to the Honourable Member of Inkster, I should say, that the whole purpose of this Bill is to give diversification and to prevent as much as we possible can the saying, as one person put it to me "pretty soon we'll build one institution and we'll all crawl into it." I'm not saying this in any criticism of the member's feeling. I quite agree with him that all these people, that we're better, just as the Act says, to stimulate charitable groups, church groups, religious groups, to form this -- to develop this type of housing. This brings great joy to people in their old age to be in an institution when they get very aged. And the need for hostels is great because the great age at which people are coming into hostels, makes it necessary that we have them, that is the type of care where the patient comes down for meals and for -- has a central dining room and so on. The age of an institution in my home town of 115 people is 83 years of age. Often shortly after admission one or two of these people may have a slight stroke or become a little ill. They may be laid up in bed for three weeks to a month. These old people, when this occurs, become very demoralized if they have to be moved to a hospital. Most of the homes caring for the aged in the hospital type accommodation such as the Fairview Home in Brandon, the Bethel Home in Gimli, have found that a certain number of infirmary beds are very important. And we find now with the hospital plan upon us, that I don't think it will be too long, Mr. Speaker, before the federal authorities see it our way and will come along with us in this type of development. We have to keep a certain proportion of these beds in these hostels as infirmary beds and not let them become too numerous, otherwise we will be running second rate hospitals such as happened in Nova Scotia a long time ago when they built many hostels throughout the land and let them become absolutely full of sick people and they became known as county poor houses, because then -- another factor there, of course, was the lack of standards. So we feel, and the people we have talked to feel, that we're better to keep the infirmary portion down to a 20% level and to promote this type of scheme.

Now in Saskatchewan, as the Honourable Member from St. John's mentioned, our legislation is better, our grant structure is better, and also there they follow CHMC regulations

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . where you have to have two housing units for every hostel bed. In the desire for the hostel type of accommodation complementing the housing type, they have had to build quite a few more of the housing units than was really desirable. That's why we felt in the hostel type accommodation we would have more flexibility by not worrying about the Federal Government guaranteeing the loan in this instance. I would inform the House that I have written the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, whom I feel should allow the diversification and open up their Act to guarantee loans where there are a certain proportion of infirm beds. I think too, Mr. Speaker, the hospital plan will sooner or later show that this is true.

I've had many municipalities in also, where they wish to build low cost housing units in various smaller towns around the central larger towns where they plan to build a hostel next to say an acute hospital. This is the ideal type of arrangement that we would like to see the municipalities do. And again almost any municipality, any charitable group and so on, can do this. The Member for Seven Oaks brought up a point where he pointed out that in this development, that this very fine new Canadian has ventured in the field of elderly persons housing, that the rents are \$45.00. Again Mr. Speaker, I do not know of an elderly person housing unit in the Province of Manitoba renting under \$40.00 a month service. This again is the reason for our increased grant structure to try and bring this rental down in order to prevent too much subsidization being necessary at the top. We do feel again that the type of housing that this gentleman had was obtained through the - by formation of a limited dividend company representing a five or ten percent equity of the individual - is not as desirable with a 90% loan in that case as is the type of legislation we have here. I quite agree with everyone in pointing out the many benefits of this type of legislation. I do agree that -- and the Age and Opportunity Bureau made a very big point in saying - "We do not believe in institutions. We don't want to see these people in institutions. We'd rather see them in diversified type of housing. Some people like to be alone and make a pot of coffee for their old friends in a single unit; some married couples double units. Some would like a fraternity house type of development with a communal recreational room plus their own kitchen facilities." This again - we are giving the enabling legislation for this type of development. Some towns want to develop the units with a central hostel. Again there's wide diversification available to them. But the big thing is leadership. When we hear of these developments we got to get our director out there to meet with these groups, to have different designs and ideas available for them. The Age and Opportunity Bureau brought this out. And the big point they said, hostels alone are not the answer. Keep old people independent, the ones that want to be, as long as you can. Wherever again we had the pure hostel development such as in Gimli and other places, you now have the desire for the boards to branch out into low cost single and double housing units. They see the need for both. Under our plan we can go this without the restrictions as I say, of Central Housing and Mortgage.

Again I quite agree with -- two speakers have mentioned, lonesomeness and - loneliness I should say, is the biggest deterrent in old age - the greatest difficulty. I had the privilege of attending a course on stressing and aging a few years back in Philadelphia, where I heard a man, Dr. Solomon, who is Chief of Psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital, who said, when a bunch of general practitioners were asking him what sedatives he used in the aged, because every physician finds that pretty soon he's changing his pills all the time, he said "I don't allow a pill in my institution of 3,500 beds. I insist that the intern goes and spends half an hour with his patient." This was very significant and shows that this is a universal finding. However, I have pointed out that we -- it's been indicated that what do we expect to develop in elderly persons housing? I don't think -- I think the legislation is one thing, and I emphasize again, I feel the leadership in bringing this to the public is the next. How successful we are there will depend how much we'll be asking you for next year. Thank you.

MR. GRAY: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Although it may be too early, can you tell the House if the Bill is passed, what will be the procedure for individual applicants?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): In answer to that question I would say that as soon as the Bill is passed we would hope to set up our director of elderly persons' housing, and this would be the man to whom any charitable group or municipality and so on, should get in contact with right

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) away and talk over the matter with him. Our Welfare Department.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question? I recognize this is a new venture, but doesn't the Minister have some objective for the next year or two -- 100 units, 200, 500, something, so that we may have some idea of what's been planned.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): of old folks housing in four years, that's my objective.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 88. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Labour, I wonder if the House would permit this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

HON. DUFF. ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 8.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think it was generally understood last night that we would take Welfare sometime this afternoon, so, if the Committee is agreeable, we will proceed with Welfare on page 20 right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3. Welfare Division. (a) Public Welfare Services.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I think I have said probably a little more than I should have said about the Department of Health -- Public Welfare, -- but I'm sure that in introducing these estimates I really haven't got a great deal to say as regards to the principle as to why these things are up. As we come to each item, I'd be only too glad to enlarge upon them if I may. I feel that the one thing the Committee should bear in mind as they go through the items, the big change is in the Public Welfare Services, and the major increases as we note are in salaries; it will be necessary for us to recruit the staff to do the job; we have been understaffed largely in the past in this field; it's a challenge to the administration to get this staff and to do the job that we want to do. Our supplies and materials will be up from the same reason, because of increased staff. Under Social Allowances, as you know, we now lump together Social Assistance and Mothers' Allowance type of cases which the province formerly paid 100%, that is the Mothers' Allowance case load of around one million, one every year, plus the Social Allowance item -- Social Assistance item; and then in addition to that, this year for the balance of this year, or, we anticipated that we certainly wouldn't be facing a full year's estimate in this Department and we therefore temporized the figure four million, six. And I point out also that here again the province is relieving the municipalities of child welfare 100%, which makes our item of \$928, 000. 00 as the estimate for child welfare in the coming year. Also you will notice increase in grants to charitable institutions which as we will find, is largely absorbed through the increased staff to the -- necessitated by the Children's Aid Society. The Children's Aid Society, of course, receives about \$200, 000. 00 a year in volunteer funds, and the province will be paying the full per diem cost of children committed to their care.

Our municipal aid expenditures are naturally down because the municipalities will be spending less. When we come to the Alcohol Rehabilitation item, I shall be only too glad to make a statement in that regard.

Further in the estimates there is really nothing -- no major policy changes at all except I would like to say under the item of Disability Allowance. We have managed to achieve a slightly greater interpretation of this allowance or of these regulations. This is a Federal Act, this is an Act which is shared 50-50 with the government and we must adhere to the legislation which says in effect "that a person must be totally incapacitated, (b) that that incapacity must continue as far as we can tell will continue indefinitely; and thirdly that it interferes with normal living."

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . Now all of us in this House have a different interpretation of those words -- three purposes as set out in the Federal regulations, but I spoke to the Minister concerning this and we had the Federal representative out here last fall and he met with our DA panel and we found statistically that we were not taking advantage of this allowance to the extent that other provinces were. We were one of the lowest. And it was simply that they were able to broaden this, especially in the direction of mental incapacity. I'm sure we all know of certain individuals who are really not totally and permanently incapacitated. They are people who are able to dress themselves and get around although some of them may even be crippled. But they have never made a proper living and there are many reasons back of this. It might have been the upbringing, the attitude of the family towards such a person and so on. In any event, the man becomes a non-bread winner and in cases like this the Federal authorities told us we could relax somewhat there and this has meant a substantial increase in the numbers of people who have come on disability allowance. And we are, because of this relaxation, reviewing systematically all the applications that have been refused since the allowance started. And to this end we achieved - have done quite a bit of work. And also the estimate is up a bit because we require more medical consultation in this year to complete this survey. I think that's really all I can say in introducing the item in sort of a general way, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have one disagreement to voice concerning the Honourable the Minister, and it is this; that when he began his remarks by saying that he thought perhaps he had said too much already on this matter. I want to say to him that I think that the one reason that he's got along so well with what are admittedly very difficult estimates, is because he has said a lot; because it requires a lot to be said; and because he tried his level best to answer all the questions fully and completely; and because he seems to be tremendously interested in his subject. Having said that and I mean it quite sincerely, I would also say that the Honourable the Minister, knowing my record in this regard would perhaps not expect me not to be as enthusiastic about some of these programs as he is. I can't help but thinking about the cost of some of them. And the question that I would like to - there are two questions that I would like to ask. One is, and I think perhaps that I should address this to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer rather than to the Minister. I understood the Minister to indicate that with regard to the Social Allowances vote of four million six, that in this vote the Department recognized that they were not facing a full year - now perhaps I misunderstood the Minister - but if that was a correct interpretation of what he said, I think it is right to say that even though we certainly haven't a full year to go from now, it still is the fact, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the advances under which the Department has been working up-to-date, will be absorbed into this amount that we're voting now. So that if that is correct, then this amount of four six is the effective vote for the year. Is that not right?

MR. ROBLIN: I just want to be sure that I know what my honourable friend means "the effective vote for the year." The figures shown here are the monies that we expect to spend during the course of the year. But it is quite right to say that this does not represent what it will cost us to operate this plan for a full year, because, as honourable members will appreciate, it wasn't considered wise by us to proceed with these matters, certainly until the House had given its approval to the Social Allowances Bill, and associated matters with it, certainly until we'd been returned to power. So we didn't wish to go ahead with any of these plans and hiring the people to man them until such time as we knew that we would have the full responsibility for carrying them out without any question. So, that means that it's going to be a few months, I don't know how many, no more than we can help, before we have the full staff employed and this program in action. So that no money is being paid out under it at the present time; nor will it be until such time as the machinery is in operation. So that means that the figures shown in here represent the cost for what we guess we'll spend - and it is a guess in large measure - in the balance of this fiscal year after the plan gets rolling. The estimate that we will bring in next year which will reflect a full year's experience, and there's a lot of experience to be gained in this, let's admit it frankly, will be very considerably higher than the figures that are shown in these estimates this year. I trust that's what my honourable friend was driving at.

MR. CAMPBELL: That, Mr. Chairman, is what I was driving at, but I'm afraid I was misinterpreting what the Honourable the Minister meant; because what I had thought he meant was that the interim supply that we had voted had taken care of the expenditure. But I realize

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . that that isn't the case, and I quite understand the situation. I thought that's what the Honourable the Minister meant. I see that it wasn't. That's quite O.K.

Mr. Chairman, the other question that I was going to ask the Minister himself, was with regard to the Disability Allowances. I listened carefully to the report that he made and I know that he has been dealing with the matter. Does he feel that there is a good likelihood of the Federal Government relaxing its attitude with regard to the very strict interpretations that they now place upon disability?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in that regard I'd just like to try and explain to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the main difficulty was that they were worried very much about the field of 'partial' disability. They have spelled out this word totally incapacitated, and physically one almost has to be, just as it says, totally incapacitated. But then other provinces were getting this, although the person wasn't totally incapacitated, they were certainly totally incapacitated in our mind as far as normal living went. They were not living normally even though not totally incapacitated. And I think every panel across the land has a slight variation of this, and it's a very difficult thing. However, I would point out to the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, that in our new Social Allowances Act where we have an individual who doesn't quite measure up to the disability legislation, but who, in the opinion of the Department and the opinion of doctors and so on, certainly can't live normally or make his way in the world, and is in need, we can meet that. So I look at it as though our Social Allowances Act kind of fixes the DA.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I can understand how easy it would be with the different boards, different panels operating in the different provinces, how difficult -- how easy it would be rather than difficult -- for there to be ten different interpretations of disability. I can see that. But I would think that the place that you would expect to get the uniformity would be in the Federal interpretation of that term of disability. As a matter of fact, I always understood that that was our controlling factor here in Manitoba. And shouldn't the Federal Government have added that touch of uniformity so that even if individual provinces interpreted the term differently, that the Federal Government would see that all were treated equally in that regard.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, that is why I asked this head of this panel in Ottawa to come and speak to our panel members - because I wanted this defined. And I should have been more clear, Sir, but the things that we found - that he found here, was that our panel was not interpreting the mental incapacity, the person in the light of their psychiatric history and so on, as liberally as were the other provinces. Now there were one or two provinces who were at as low a case load as we were, but for instance you come to one province it was way up, and this is where he thought that we were being a little too strict possibly. He thought this is where both his federal member of the panel and the provincial member should look at this type of patient. Although not totally physically incapacitated, they certainly were incapacitated mentally to the point where they could not make a normal living, and therefore he said we could take them on. Now, previously they were excluded - I think that's the best way of putting it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the first question raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the answer given by the First Minister in respect of this four million six. Now if I understood the Provincial Treasurer correctly, he mentioned that he didn't know exactly when this plan would gather their staff, they were waiting the passage of the new Social Allowances Bill, and the estimates, and it may take a little while to get the thing rolling. Now I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer whether or not he anticipated when he laid the estimates before us, before the cessation of the last legislature, that it would take the same period of time in order to have this measure passed, presuming that the same administration was upheld at that session. Because I note that it's exactly the same figure in respect of Social Allowances now in the estimates as were in the previous estimate. Did they anticipate at that time, had the estimates been passed and the Social Allowances Bill passed in the last session, that it would have taken just as long as up till today, plus an additional couple of months, as suggested by the First Minister in order to get going?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, our judgment on those matters was pretty close to being accurate.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon? I didn't hear that.

MR. ROBLIN: We were pretty close to estimating the course of events.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, that's all very well for my honourable friend the First Minister to say today. Then can I take it from that then that in respect of the last session of the legislature, you were determined that in the interim between then and now, that there would be another provincial election? Do I take from your words that despite your statement on the hustings that we defeated you, that you are now admitting that you foresaw it, and that the reason that the estimate was as is now, and was then, included that?

MR. ROBLIN: I've lost the tract of that rather wordy question; would you repeat it?

MR. PAULLEY: Well I'll try and make it simple so as my friend can understand it. (Interjection) Do I take it from your remarks then, when you state that you foresaw the events and that the amount of the estimate now is the same as it was then; that despite your public statement that we defeated you, that you knew you were going to get defeated, and thereby only provided in your estimate. And if we carry that through to its logical conclusion, then you certainly have been wrong, in accusing we of the Opposition in deferring the payments of social assistance and allowances as outlined in your Bill, to the needy people in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think I can prevent my honourable friend from taking any meaning he wishes from what I said, because he's pretty good at that. I certainly have no intention of rehashing the debate as to how the government was defeated, but I am going to get to the central point of what he's talking about. And that is, did we estimate that it would take us several months of time to prepare these procedures so that this could be put into effect, and we certainly did. Now we had two alternatives when we came to print these estimates: we could reduce the amount if we wished, because we realized that the time element was now extended, or we could leave it in. We decided to leave it in. We don't know whether we're going to use it all - or maybe more - or maybe not all of it. Because this is a brand new program; we've never tried it before; we have to find out how much it costs. And we had the simple choice of going through the calculations and taking an arbitrary reduction for another couple of months as to the date as which this thing would be operating, and thus changing our estimates. And I can assure my friend that there is nothing so sinister to be read into these figures as he is trying to make out.

MR. PAULLEY: There wasn't much sinister read into the figures. All I was going by was the statement of the Honourable the First Minister himself, and if he would take the time tomorrow - or when we meet again, or when the copies of Hansard are available - to read what he said in his opening remarks in answer to my question, he'll find that I'm not raising sinister questions on this - on the amount.

MR. ROBLIN: No, but you are willing to put the worst construction on them.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm just willing to use your own words, my friend.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm not your friend; I'm your honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: All right, Mr. Chairman, may I in all humility retract the fact that I called the First Minister my friend? -- my honourable friend.

MR. ROBLIN: That's it.

MR. PAULLEY: Who now wears the crown!

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I think the point which is important is this, that when these estimates were proposed at the last session, before the election, the amount proposed was for exactly the amount which is being proposed today, namely \$4, 684, 000. 00. Now the public was told - and I suppose that many things are permissible during an election - but the public was told on almost every platform during that election campaign, that by the defeat of the government, the day when the people who needed assistance - the old age pensioners and the people on mothers' allowances and so on - the day when they would get the increased assistance had been postponed. Now, if this were so, Mr. Chairman, if they could have gone ahead with it almost immediately, as was inferred by almost every speaker and every candidate for the government, then since it has been deferred, obviously today when we are discussing a much shorter period, the amount should be smaller. I said during the campaign - I didn't get much coverage, I'm just a backbencher - I said during the campaign that from the draft estimate, one could only assume one of two things - either that the amounts which would be given to the people who were going to get increases was much less than they had been led to

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . believe, or else - and I wanted to be honest - or else that it would take somewhere between four and six months to set up the organization to administer this. This is what I believed, and this is what is proved in these draft estimates - the fact that it takes time, and that, therefore, it would have been October the first before this program could have started, whether we had an election or not. I don't mind, because I know it takes time to set this up; but I do resent - I resented it then and I still resent - I think it was completely unfair for candidates - and they did it from one end of the province to the other, representing the government party - to suggest that in fact the time when people would get increased assistance was delayed by the defeat of the government. It was not delayed - it would have taken the government till October the first to do it, and it's proved by the figure which we have today.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member made a number of interesting statements during the election, one of them which was that the Communist Party was supporting the members of the government. He made a - and I don't think that what he said now is of much more validity than what he said on that particular matter. I would like to point out to him that what was said at that time about the delay is right, because we have had to spend 46 days - or whatever it is - having a general election, and we couldn't open the House right away, and no government, I think, should proceed with these matters until they've been approved by the House, and that's what we've done. But I say to my honourable friend opposite that I am surprised that they haven't raised this issue before, because it isn't merely in connection with Health and Welfare that we've faced this problem, but it is in connection with other matters. Take the proceedings in the Attorney-General's Department for prison reform, and matters of that sort - all of them have had to have been delayed. Now we could go through these estimates and knock off, if we had taken the trouble to do so, some money here and there to take account of that fact. We didn't do so. But there is nothing sinister in that fact.

MR. PAULLEY: There is, Mr. Chairman, if I may, one vast difference in this. Because my honourable friend opposite did say to the people of Manitoba, and made specific reference on numerous occasions both over TV, radio and the public platform, and emphasized this particular item, that we were the ones who caused it. And my honourable friend, in his opening statement today, said that he prejudged that that was what was going to happen in respect of when these estimates were laid before us at the last session of the last legislature. But apart from that - apart from that - my honourable friend knew just after the date of the election that his administration was going to continue into power, not on the same basis as before, but with a supreme majority over all parties in this House; and I suggest this, in all deference to the First Minister, of another period of but two or three months that the organization could have been set up; because I would suggest this, that in other fields as well, that the administration has not waited until the formal approval of these estimates and the bringing down of the budget to do other essential things which are part of their program. Now if the Honourable the First Minister can assure me that no department at all has been expanded or increased in respect of staff or additional expenditures of money until such time as this House formally has passed all of the estimates, then I have to retract my thoughts in respect of getting ahead with the job of Manitoba. But I do suggest that that is not the case - that the programs of expansion in other departments have gone on without - as my honourable friend says - the passing of these estimates formally.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, even if I were able to say to my honourable friend that other departments had gone on in the interval, he would still have to reckon with the actual time of the election itself. We can't get away from that point. But I would like to say this - and I say this in all seriousness and I'm not trying to be difficult with my honourable friend - I would say this, that I think it would have been wrong for us to have proceeded by the Special Warrant method in carrying out the programs that we had envisaged, even if we had been successful in winning the election, and therefore, had had public approval of them; because during the election we undertook to hold a session, convene as soon as we possibly could afterwards, which we did. Now I very much doubt that it would have been proper for us to have had recourse, except in cases of emergencies, and I think probably the Royal Visit may have been the only one where Special Warrants needed to be passed. Because after all the House, before we rose for the election, did give us interim supply to carry on with, so that we could carry on the business of the government.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) Now I would say this to my honourable friend, that in any department where they were able to work within the limits of that interim supply and they had an urgent case for hiring a man here or there, in connection with that matter, I would have no doubt that that may have taken place, and that to that extent his view of the matter may be correct. But you have to remember that in this department we're hiring another 60 or 70 people to make this thing go, and that once they get going the rate of outpay of money is something which no interim supply measure could possibly take care of. So I don't think that, being practical about this thing, I don't think that I am open to the charge that he is trying to make that we did it in one department - why not in another. We may have made some moves within the limitations of the special - of the supplementary supply that was passed, but not beyond that and not into the field of special warrants, which otherwise would be the case. After all, the House was meeting, and I thought once the House starts to meet, we can't even do that - special warrant isn't open to us - so we simply don't have the money until the House votes it.

MR. PAULLEY: Doesn't my honourable friend think that the basis of this program could have been laid in the interim - even if he's right about the actual expenditure of the money in the form of cheques going out to recipients of this assistance? But could not of, in the interim, all of the basis of the plan been ready for operation so that on the passage of the Bill and the passage of the estimates - which are assured, because my honourable friend wears the crown - could not that have been done? Now my honourable friend, if I understood him correctly, says it will be a matter of a couple of months or so before the organization gets cracking on this thing, and I suggest that that foundation, or groundwork, could have been laid long before.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Friend's suggestion is out of place. As I've already said, the first thing you've got to do is meet the payroll. We haven't got the money to meet the payroll until my honourable friends give it to us.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to take one minute to correct an impression of a very unimportant matter. The Honourable First Minister said - I think he said, as I got it - that I said during the election that the Communists were supporting

MR. ROBLIN: You may not have said it, but I gathered that from the newspapers.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well what I said, Mr. Chairman - I think it was reported fairly in the newspaper, but I would like it to be in the records - I simply pointed out that the only three candidates nominated by the Communists were nominated in those constituencies represented by my Honourable Friend from Inkster, My Honourable Friend from Burrows and myself; that obviously they had no chance of election and that the only thing which their nomination could do would be possibly to add a couple of seats on that side of the House. I did suggest somewhat facetiously - I don't suppose anybody took me seriously, unless possibly the Honourable the First Minister - that if they hadn't received financial help from that side of the House that they ought to ask for it. I don't think anybody else took it very seriously. (Interjection) I wish we had more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) 1 Passed. 2. Passed.

.....Continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if I may, the other day when we were discussing your new Social Allowances Bill I asked if you could supply the Committee with the figures that were formerly paid by the municipalities, which will be taken over by the provincial authority. Were you able to get those figures, Mr. Minister?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You don't mean the total cost -- the total relief to municipalities?

MR. PAULLEY: No, what I actually meant, Mr. Chairman, if I may, the Minister has informed us, and we're glad to hear it, that the provincial authority is going to take over certain responsibilities and expenditures, which were formerly taken care of by the municipalities; and my request was, the supplying of, the approximate amount of money which was formerly paid by the municipalities, say in any given year, which is now going to be taken over by the provincial authority.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gross -- let's see we're in the Department of Welfare. The municipal year ends on the 31st of December, and we projected this forward on our experience to date, till the end of March -- we haven't got the final windup for March, but as close as we can deduct, in this past year the gross municipal expenditures up until March 31st, 1959, would be Three million, three twenty-five; and the reimbursements on that would be Two million 063, for a net municipal expenditure of One million, two. Now when our program gets going on a full year's basis, that is the present program based on a year, we estimate that the gross municipal expenditure will be One million, zero three three, with a provincial reimbursement of .433. But you can see quite readily in the estimates this year that in, for instance, take Child Welfare; formerly they got approximately, on the 40-80 basis, the municipalities were reimbursed in that total figure, and then again, now that is pulled out of municipal reimbursement. There is one thing. Another thing, we are relieving the municipalities of the aged and infirm, and all those cases of desertion and death over a year, as you know, and jail. Instead of the municipalities paying these in the first instance, the province will take that over, so we are leaving the municipalities with those three things -- desertion and jail under a year, and unemployable adults. So our provincial -- this is where you get a little mixed up -- the municipal reimbursement is much less because the municipal expenditure is much less, and in one instance the province is assuming a large hunk of what was formerly municipal responsibility. But then again, once the program gets to its full fruition and we get our cash allowances set up, you can see again that this of course is something that will be quite over and above these municipal relief problems. Now I think that .. does that answer your question Sir? -- No?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess possibly we'll have to discuss this so we get together on the deal, but actually what I was trying to arrive at was the total amount -- apart from the 40-60 or any other recovery back from the provincial government which municipalities got -- the total amount which was formerly expended by municipalities for all of the services which were provided. What I am trying to arrive at -- and maybe this is the wrong way of going around it -- what I'm trying to arrive at was the former total cost of the provision of the services rendered by the municipalities for which, of course, they were reimbursed by the province, I know that -- but the total expenditure in respect of child welfare, social assistance and the likes of that, in the Province of Manitoba, so that we could arrive at the picture of what the actual added contributions of the province -- or the actual increase in the amount, shall I say -- that is going to be paid overall in respect of these services. Am I a little more clear now?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well I'll try and be more clear, but I think we have to attack it from another angle. If we have the gross, Mr. Chairman, the gross municipal expenditure last year -- let's say it was Three million. Three; then the province had an expenditure of the Mothers' Allowance case load of around One million, One or One Million, Two, plus social assistance in unorganized territories. Those two were purely provincial. The municipalities paid out the Three million three, or we estimated by the end of March of last year. Then again the total municipal expenditure of Three million three included aged and infirm and all those cases we have mentioned except the three types that they are going to be left with. Now all I can explain is that in a whole year, this will mean a relief to the municipalities of Two million three. We'll be relieving them in a full year of Two Million three of this responsibility; and leaving them with those three types of cases; where previously the province, for instance, only

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) paid, .290 for wards of the province, in relieving the municipalities we relieve them and our bill becomes 928. It would cost the municipalities Six hundred thousand; but that's in your Three million three of their total disbursement. In other words, the total gross municipal disbursement is Three million three, we figured up until March of this year. Our own program will cost, I think, by the end of March, Two million eight, and these are up because of the increased per diem rates of the aged and infirm in our nursing homes which the municipalities are paying. And then again these two plus Child Welfare gives, for instance, a total provincial cost last year of Four million nine. That is our reimbursement to municipalities plus our payments -- our own provincial cases came to Four million Nine four five. That's the total provincial ticket.

Now, for the portion of the year, you can see the difficulty we're in, and I'm not a bookkeeper, but I must say that the Provincial Treasurer has been most helpful in assisting me in this interim period. However, we did put this figure -- we realized right off the top that our provincial social allowance and mothers' allowance this year for the balance of the year on the new program will be about Two million seven, because we'll be picking up a lot of that other stuff. Then again, we just put Two million dollars in; we thought that would be ample because we knew what it was going to cost us for a whole year, and last spring when we drew these up -- and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the department, the civil servants there, have worked long hours in the past year drawing up this Act, hundreds of meetings, hundreds of hours of overtime, of my senior, the deputy and his assistant in assisting me in trying to bring this in, put it in black and white -- and I must say that I don't think it could have been done any more efficiently than these men have assisted me in trying to do. Certainly if there is any lag here, it's my responsibility. But I do feel that we felt our new program would cost us so much for the year, and we felt honestly that last spring when we said this that -- before the last election -- that this would take us till October to get the staff, because supposing we do -- wanted to start right away with cash allowances, and we're trying to build this staff, it will take -- one worker probably could make four or five investigations a day, going to see these people to see what their needs are. You multiply that by, in a month say she made a hundred calls -- or he -- in a staff of 22 -- 2200 calls a month. It will take you three months to process 6,000 applications the way we want to do it. We realize that's why we need staff. But this is going to take time, and it's no use trying to fool anyone. We're as anxious as can be to get this program into effect and we're going to go at it as hard as we can; and the staff have shown tremendous co-operation and we're adding -- we've got 53 positions filled at the moment, and we want another 20 or 30 odd workers -- personnel to get the program into full operation. We've had hundreds of meetings concerning medical care programs and all that sort of thing which we hope to finalize once the Bill is passed in principle and the estimates are passed. However, the gross municipal expenditures will go down by that amount of money on a full year's program.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, knowing now, that the estimates will be passed, then we will get Royal Assent, can the Minister give some comfort to those who expect this additional help, as to an approximate date at least -- after losing a year I'm not going to discuss it any more -- a year of hopes, anyway, expected it last year -- can he tell the House and the public as to when the machinery will be set up and in full operation?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well Mr. Chairman, last spring we thought it would take us at least until October the 1st to get our program really going if everything went very well. We have lost a few months in here of effort in the field, and in our estimates and so on, but I can assure the Honourable Member from Inkster that we will proceed just as fast as we possibly can, and that is our desire. That is what we want to do, and certainly -- I can't make a specific date; I think I would be foolish to do so in all honesty -- but we certainly do hope to have some of this assistance coming out to those in need as soon as we can this year. I would hope to put as much effort into it as we could, starting in right away, and up until the end of October, November, we should be starting to get some of these things going. But I don't think it would be fair for me at this time, with the tremendous change that will occur here, to give a firm commitment. I really

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, we have at present many borderline cases, that is people that need help but that cannot qualify at the present. Perhaps if I give a

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) specific case, the Minister could answer me a little easier. I know of a young 10-year old girl who became quite ill; she was sent from one doctor to the other. It cost a lot for transportation, her mother had to accompany the child, she had other children at home and she had to have babysitters. They had quite a few operations and, to make a long story short, there were a lot of bills -- hospital, doctor bills, transportation and so on. Now the father is certainly not well off - what we would consider well off, but he's always paid his way. He owns and operates a very small store in a rural area, but if he has to pay these bills, well, he will be out of business. My question to the Honourable Minister, would be, when this Social Allowances Bill is passed, would that cover cases like this and if so, will this case -- could these people apply even though the bills were incurred before this Social Allowances Bill came into force? When I am up, Mr. Minister, there is another question that I would like to ask. There are some of the homes for the aged and infirm who have submitted their budgets, that is, they've asked the government to approve their rate per patient per day, and so far they haven't heard anything and they had to keep on operating.

Now if the rate is not approved and if a lower rate is approved causing a deficit, can the Honourable Minister tell me how the operators of these homes can find and where they can find the monies to operate?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, all I can say to the first question is that this will depend on the need that is present on our staff and availability of same. We certainly -- my intention would be to have branch offices and so on to have centralized policy and to get our workers out into the field to which that woman applies, and is in receipt of some assistance now. She would certainly be on the list and as soon as she makes application it is our hope, depending how fast we can recruit this staff, to get someone to go and see her. I can only assure him a determined effort and I would be only too glad if left the name of this party with the department, that we might take a quick look at it.

Secondly, survey concerning the per diem rates in our nursing homes. It probably doesn't come up under -- maybe it should come up under this item. As I indicated earlier we did undertake prior to moving into the field of aged and infirm from 100% as we will, to look into the per diem costs and rates in our nursing homes. Some of these are private nursing homes and so on, others are institutions I think he is referring to, and we started that survey last April during the sitting, and have continued it, and I've just the other day got in the first recommendation on one of the larger institutions which will be discussed by the Treasury Board very shortly, and we are moving as fast as we can in this field. In fact I hope to have all the nursing homes surveyed very shortly. Now the honourable member can understand that, we were asked to give a flat increase of \$5.25 per day to every nursing home regardless of standards and regardless of types of patients, and we felt that we should have a good look at

MR. DESJARDINS: Did you say an increase or bring the rate up to \$5.25 a day?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well the per diem rate as paid previously was \$3.75 per day is all they were getting, and we felt that a uniform increase like that really didn't sound right to our budget department of the plan who had gone in there, for instance some homes have domiciliary patients, others have nothing but bed patients, and obviously the type of care is different and a per diem rate of a higher standard may be coming to that home in order to provide the care that we would like to see them provide. That is what we're working on now. And as for deficits created in the past over many years we are also looking into a policy decision in that regard also.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I meant only a deficit for this year because if these institutions have more or less counted on this increase of this rate and they've been operating using that to fix their budget, there might be a deficit for this year. And my first question, I certainly didn't intend to put the Minister on the spot, I was just using that as an example to see if those people could get help. And another question that wasn't answered -- even if those bills were incurred before for those people if they're still faced with that -- it would be either that or get relief. I wanted to know if those could be considered also.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I just indicated that that is before us now. That was brought to my attention the other day as the honourable member probably knows, and we think we will strike up a formula to assist these people as of from the first of the year; and in setting future per diem rates to take a realistic look at their liabilities, that is in the type of

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) home that he is referring to. I must make it clear that many nursing homes have been doing a very excellent job, tremendous job, and this survey is revealing some very fine work. On the other hand there are some places where people are up and around and where the per diem rate should be looked at. But I can assure the honourable member that this whole matter has been receiving very close scrutiny from the budget team that I had survey this institution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to keep this up, I appreciate the work that is being done by the Minister and I agree with him in most of the cases but I still would like to know -- because those people are worried -- what will happen this year if they have a deficit, or hasn't there any decision been made on that until the Honourable Minister hears from his experts who are studying this?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The payments made by us will be sufficient I'm sure to cover the deficit that they've been working under due to the cases of provincial responsibility that are in there since the first of January.

MR. DESJARDINS: You say the case of the provincial. If I understand this right, certain municipalities are just waiting for the government to approve or set a rate, and if the rate -- some are already paying \$5.25 -- and if the rate set by the government is lower I believe that the homes in question will then have to refund the money to such municipalities, and I understand that the City of Winnipeg has refused to do anything until they see what rate the government will set. So if the government help they could still have a deficit from patients they have been keeping from other municipalities if the municipalities follow the rate that the government sets.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I can assure the honourable member that the budget committee or the team that went into these nursing homes and did the study to which I have referred, and which they are just completing, are meeting this very realistically; that is they are taking all the per diem costs into consideration. But I am sure the honourable member will agree with me that a flat \$5.25 to every institution just isn't -- we can't do that when we're paying 100% of the care. We have to go in there and determine what we should be paying them for the type of care that's being rendered and we will meet this realistically, and we will take into consideration deficits as from the time we are committed to do so. I would inform the honourable member that most municipalities have had no choice but to increase their payments to \$5.25 a day, and only the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba to my mind, have not increased this flat across the board until we had a look at this and saw what we were doing. I think that's only common sense, and that's why we took this survey. And I can assure the honourable member that the per diem costs will be met if a deficit has been created because of paying them \$3.75 a day; if we feel that say an institution should be getting \$5.00 a day; and should have been getting it as from the time they made this request; that's exactly what we should do, and the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba are the only two who haven't paid this flat increase until they see what we're doing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that I appreciate and I agree with the Minister that they are doing the right thing. I'm not debating that at all. My concern was just that if some of these homes have, maybe if they did they were not right in doing so, but if they are operating on the assumption that they will receive \$5.00, well then they could have a deficit and it would be very, very hard to get money -- I don't know where they would get the money to pay for this deficit. I doubt very much, I think that most of those people running these homes are very sincere, and I think that probably everything will be alright and the government will give them maybe not exactly what they're asking, but enough to pay; but there's still a possibility seeing that we're so late in the year; there is still a possibility that there could be a deficit, and without the Minister being wrong in the way that he operated. I didn't mean that at all.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the -- or is there provision made in the Social Allowances Act to provide for doctor's bill and expensive drugs, and if so, is there a limitation on each of them?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Concerning, Mr. Chairman, the question of medical care, drugs and so on; yes, we have had preliminary discussions concerning the provision of the medical

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.)and other care to the recipients of public assistance and our senior citizens in need; and we have progressed quite favourably with these discussions in trying to study various comprehensive schemes and costs. I'm not at liberty at this time to divulge them but as the Act states, and as I have stated, we are proceeding as fast as we can in this regard and I would say that I just don't know when, but in the not too distant future our plan would be to bring down a scheme with these various bodies. We have met with some of the associations already; have done so over the past year and I think we will have a pretty good scheme for our senior citizens.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, the new Social Allowances Act, the purpose of it as outlined by the Minister is to meet need. And also as was outlined by him the cases were to be looked at on an individual basis, and that I think, to put it briefly, actually is the ultimate in any type of social assistance, and we certainly hope that it will work.

However, the reason I rise is to try and determine a little more explicitly just how one would interpret this word 'need' because the boundary between need and not being in need is certainly not sharp nor distinct. I would like to ask the Minister, and just to simplify it I would pose a hypothetical situation, would his Social Allowance Act and I presume he knows, because he is the one who is primarily the moulder of it. Would this Social Allowance Act provide some type of assistance to a situation or a case in which you have a family, the family itself actually not in need but just on that borderline situation where if events took a wrong turn to a very small degree, they would be in need. So if you have that situation where they are just above need and they have say a dependent, let us say a girl 17 years old, 18 years old who is a semi-invalid or actually who has been a victim of polio some years back; today let us say that she is comparatively healthy, nevertheless the parents cannot afford to send her on to school. Now does that constitute 'need' in that family. Would anything be done in a case like that? Because if the parents did attempt to send that girl on to school, perhaps they could do so only by depriving themselves of just that amount of worldly goods that would put them in what one could properly call need. I realize that this is rather vague, but I do believe that there will be many situations such as this that social workers will meet in trying to administer this Act, and I would ask the Honourable Minister if a situation such as that would constitute 'need' in his interpretation?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, almost like everything else there is a beginning and an end to everything. If I was a social worker called upon that case where I found a semi-invalid polio victim otherwise healthy, not able to work, completely dependent upon her parents, who are in a very low income level and sacrificing something of their own in order to provide for the needs of the daughter -- I think the first thing there -- and this is where we have been sadly lacking for many years in our thinking I believe, and much better men than me believe -- first of all rehabilitation. What is the chance of helping that girl out of her complete dependency; otherwise healthy girl but crippled to some extent. I would like to see her brought in, maybe through the auspices of The Society for Crippled Children, but anyway to our rehabilitation hospital for assessment, where we could find out if there was anything we might do to help her in self care activity, or help her through possibly an industrial workshop or give her some means of helping herself -- I think we all believe in that philosophy first and foremost -- should we find that we cannot assist this girl in any way. But I think the last thing to do would be to send her home to a life of seclusion and so on with her parents. And again, if this created need in the family, the parents were lacking the essentials of life as spelled out in the Act, and we felt in the department, that there was need created in the home because of this situation, I think that we would have to meet that need. And I think, again, let's face it philosophically, we either try our best to measure up to the individual needs of the people of our province who are in need, or we have some blanket type of legislation which is across the board, which I don't believe, and my honourable member knows, it doesn't meet need. This is a challenge for the administration. We accept the challenge. We're going to do our best. But this is the way I think we would approach a hypothetical case of this type.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3. Pass.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me -- I try to understand what the Minister

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) means when he talks about meeting need, but it does seem to me that since when we have a figure of \$4,684,000.00 -- I realize it's an approximate figure, it's the beginning of a new program, we may not spend the whole amount or we may, as the First Minister said need more -- but it does seem to me that the figure must have been based on some kind of estimate and the estimate must have been based on some kind, some standard of allowance. Now I recognize that the allowances will vary depending as the Minister has said so often and so eloquently, on the basis of need. Still it does seem to me that the members of this Committee ought to be given -- if they can't be given the regulations in detail -- that the Minister ought to be able to give us some illustrations, a few illustrations, a few hypothetical cases. Let's take a couple on old age pension who have nothing more than the \$55.00 a month each which is provided for under the legislation and they have no other means of assistance. They have rent to meet, they have food bills to meet, they have certain -- now let's not talk about maximum medical costs, but they have certain medical costs, certain drug costs. Surely the Minister can give us some idea of what a few cases would be entitled to under the Allowances Act?

Now the Minister said, and I'm not going to say that he's wrong -- he said that this is one of the -- I think he said it's THE best Act in Canada, and it would provide a standard that the other provinces would look up to. Now surely he can give us some idea of what will be provided for when, I was going to say 'if' but I want to be fair to the Minister, when the regulations are finally drafted.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of means or needs test, I wonder if it is the intention of the government to amend the means test under the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons Allowance Board, and also under the Total Disabilities Allowances Act. I know of a specific case in my constituency that seemed to be a little unfair. The wife of this farmer after a considerable amount of consideration and deliberation by the board, they finally accepted her as a total disability case, and incidentally I was very happy to hear the Minister say this afternoon that there would be a more liberal interpretation on the words 'total disability' because I realize, too, that there are many partial disability cases in the province. In the past I think it hinged pretty well on whether you were able to feed and dress yourself and there are plenty of cases in the province. I know of 2 or 3 and there could be a good many more, in my constituency where they can feed and dress themselves but that is about the limit of what they can do. And in fact a lot of people have suggested that you had to have one foot on a banana peel and the other one in the grave to qualify, so I was very happy to hear that we could expect a little more liberal interpretation of that Act. But in this particular case that I refer to, the farmer finally was able to get a total disability pension for his wife, but then of course he had to file a statement of his income at the end of the year which was quite all right. But he had to look after his wife for several years before she got the pension and as a result of the expenditures, that he made all of his machinery become old and dilapidated and run down; his buildings became dilapidated and run down, and apparently the board said that as regards your income we take the amount of grain that you sold less gasoline, oil and minor repairs. That is they wouldn't allow depreciation on any machinery, buildings or anything else, and I don't see why a man should not be able to file a duplicate copy of his income tax to establish his income for the purpose. It seems a little unfair to me that in this particular case anyway, that they would not allow any depreciation on machinery or any other item on the farm.

Now on means test too, it seemed this afternoon as regard to bill No. 24 that in Section 2 that there is a means test established there, or a needs test, when you're qualifying persons that can get into these hostels or units at a figure of something like \$2,400.00 a year. Assuming that the rental of the suite or the unit would be \$40.00 a month, so that's \$480.00 a year, and 5 times that would be \$2,400.00 a year, so that if you were making less than \$2,400.00 a year you could qualify for residence in one of the units there. So there does seem to be a little confusion as to what a 'means test' or a 'needs test' is at the present time.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Neepawa is having difficulty with the 'needs test' or the 'means test'. Now he says what about the means test concerning old age assistance and so on. All I am trying to say, and I have said it before, and I'll say it again -- and I refer the honourable member to Hansard where I even surprised myself with the excellent example I gave that day in introducing the Social Allowances Bill -- is

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) the fact that the means test is tied to income ceiling. Over a certain income you lose part of your pension. So often that discourages the person from making a little bit themselves. We say where there is need we should meet that need. The means test or the income ceiling in itself should not be a restriction against meeting need. I don't see the philosophy where you say if a person earns under a certain amount they shall receive a certain amount of cash. If a person earns under \$850.00 a year such as in our neighboring province, the old age pensioner automatically gets \$5.00 a month. Does that meet need? It does not necessarily meet need. We say we're better to not have that type of legislation but rather we should meet need. It's as simple as it sounds.

Now the honourable member brings up the question to get back to elderly persons' housing, where he says -- "that the income ceilings here, we spell it out -- if the person, if the rental of that room minus the services, if the person has more than 5 times the rental that they would not be acceptable in that elderly persons housing on the basis of need. In other words a person that has a huge income or a large income does not need that type of housing accommodation. Now he knows as a municipal man as well as I do, that many of our charitable institutions who have constructed excellent elderly persons' housing accommodation in towns and different districts, the board members are put on the spot sometimes to admit people who have handsome income, but these people are happy to be there with other old people and so on. But if we're going to be donating so much of our provincial consolidated fund and we're making such large donations to these institutions, we should put income ceilings on those people going in. This is what Central Mortgage and Housing did. We lifted that out of there. We them more generous means test than the \$960.00 and \$1,620.00 as was previously.

Now as regards the member from St. John's speaking about the Minister giving him a few examples. I think it's spelled out in the Act, as I have said before, the regulations will have to be spelled out, but we need this little bit of elasticity and it's pretty hard to write any legislation of this sort without having regulations to give this flexibility. I've tried to point that out previously. If a couple only have \$110.00 a month and they apply, they're in need, and we assess it, we have various situations arise. That couple may be living in a small country town where they have an adequate home, but by the time they pay fuel, taxes and so on, they are in need; our worker will assess it on the basis of "well how much is food worth; what does -- do our experts say it costs to feed a person in a month." Well they say the mothers' allowance regulation now is \$23.00 per adult, times two \$46.00 for food, shelter, rent. They have no rent. This is what we mean by taking their assets into consideration. But they do have household expenses say they qualify for \$5.00 or \$10.00 there; clothing say \$5.00 a month \$10.00 personal needs, getting down town once in awhile and other personal needs as the worker may assess \$10.00, the total may come to, with heat and taxes, it may work out that they need a budget of \$115.00 or \$120.00 a month. Then in that case the province can give the difference between the income and the needs of the couple and get 50% reimbursement from Ottawa. The same for old age assistance. In the City, I think one of the best examples I ran into myself was an old age pensioner in Winnipeg paying \$25.00 a month for his room, he was paying, in this case, he was paying \$12.00 for pills for some rheumatoid arthritis -- he didn't believe in the out-patient department pills which were available to him -- but nonetheless these helped him. He had, that gave him \$37.00 a month and he was supposed to live on \$18.00. Now the Honourable Member for St. John's knows, that this is one of our biggest problems, because we have 4,200 of these people in the City of Winnipeg alone earning under \$840.00 a year and in inadequate housing. Our first step on that worker should be -- these are the people we got to help out of this type of housing, we don't want to be subsidizing poor housing. But supposing we do have to pay that rent, we have to estimate \$23.00 a month for his food bill, then he has \$12.00 extra expense that he must meet; then we have to give him \$5.00 or so at least a month for personal needs, depending on, it's allowed out now that you can go with a family of personal needs of \$10.00 in Mothers' Allowance Regulations. Supposing we made it \$5.00 and that brought him up to say \$63.00 or \$64.00 a month, that that old person required. We will have to meet that need by paying that extra allowance, but the challenge to our staff is to get that man out of this type of accommodation, bring his name or bring him to the attention of someone developing some elderly persons housing and get him

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) into this type of accommodation where his rent immediately goes down and where his needs become less. It's not that we're trying to do him out of money, but because we want to meet need. This is a very intangible subject you can go on for hours but surely it is sufficient for this government to say that in the Act we're spelling it out, that we're going to meet this need; we're going to try and meet it realistically; we're going to try to do it individually as much as possible. It is a tremendous challenge to the administration and I'm quite prepared to prepare a list of examples for the Honourable Member at any time.

MR. ORLIKOW: I suggested that in view of the flexibility with which the government is trying to attain that I recognize the difficulty and I suggest to the Minister, that he might meet part of the information we want, that some of us want, by giving a few examples of the maximum amounts that might be obtained. Now if he can supply that for me at a later date that will satisfy me, but I would really like to know, and I think the people of Manitoba would like to know, what this -- it's easy to say -- and I'm not being critical of the Minister, it's easy to say we're going to meet need, but as the Minister said what one person thinks meets need, another person may think is much too generous, and what we're trying to get is some information as to what this Government thinks will meet need.

MR. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I was pleased when the Minister said there would be a more liberal interpretation of the legislation dealing with disabled persons. But the question I'm interested in is how can the Minister tell us this, has he been informed by the Federal Minister of Health? Isn't that -- aren't they

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) Well we had one hundred and fifty odd cases since I came to power nine months ago, or since this Government's been in power. This went through nine months ago.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is this disabled persons -- does the Federal Government look after it entirely? And

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Were you in the House when I made a statement on this?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I heard you make the statement I don't remember verbatim.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well for the honourable member's benefit I'll go over this again. The DA was loosened up to include, Mr. Chairman, the type of person where -- it had been thought for a long time that there was this great disparity between provincial assessment boards and the federal regulations were pretty clear-cut. However, in noting that our percentage of acceptance was lower than the other provinces, we approached the federal authorities and we, I asked the member of the Department of National Health and Welfare to come to Manitoba, interview our panel, which he did, and it turned out that he felt the reason for our large refusal, or the large number of our refusals in this field, was because of the fact that there were many people in that fringe area where they were totally incapacitated more in the sense of a mental disability. These are people who are living in communities who can take care of self care activities and so on; they're really not totally disabled; but in the eyes of the people they're totally disabled; in the eyes of the doctor they're totally disabled only in the sense that they're not able to cope with life. And we got this group on to our disability allowance and we'll come to that item under the estimates -- I have the exact figure as to how many we've taken on since last September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3. Passed. 4. Passed. 5. Passed. 6. Passed. 7. Passed. B

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Alcoholism Foundation, I'd like to make a statement on that if I may.

MR. CHAIRMAN: B. (1).

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The Item of \$65,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, you're going to make a statement again.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): In view of the fair amount of publicity that has been given to the work of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba I think it's only fit and proper that I say a few words concerning this effort. Now as the honourable members of the Committee know, the Bracken Commission recommended that the setting up of such a foundation be accomplished, be started on, and last March the month the Nassau House opened. Nassau House consists of a renovated old house on Nassau Street and a few doors down is another older home that has been renovated and contains the offices of the foundation and staff. Last summer last August

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.)or about this time I had the pleasure of going over to the foundation, speaking to the director and going through Nassau House, and discussing their budget with them. Their budget last year was \$85,000.00 of which \$65,000.00 was a provincial grant. At that time the director and two councillors were present in the one address and his staff in Nassau House -- there were two attendants -- and at the time of my inspection Nassau House was empty. I spoke to the director of the foundation concerning this and also to the head of the medical advisory committee, Dr. Pincock, who is also provincial psychiatrist, and I had a long discussion with them concerning the aims and objectives of the foundation.

Now the treatment of alcoholism is something which has come forward by leaps and bounds in the last few years, I can tell this House that when I interned ten or eleven years ago we could not submit acute alcoholics to the wards of our large teaching hospitals. That has changed and today the man in acute alcoholic state is admitted. Starting July 1st, again in the hospital field they've opened up an out-patient clinic at the Winnipeg Psychiatric Hospital for further attacks on the problem of acute alcoholism. Now the problem as outlined to me by the -- in speaking of Nassau House at that time, with the provincial psychiatrist who also was founder of Alcoholics Anonymous in this province, he informed me that the big thing is in the province today that although people say there are ten or twelve thousand alcoholics in our province, that only one thousand of them recognize this; the other nine thousand are people who don't themselves recognize that they are alcoholics. This is the difficult area and when we speak of ten, twelve thousand in the province this is what I would like the committee to have in mind. Secondly, he pointed out that at no time the philosophy of this committee, now the committee in charge of the Nassau House and the Alcoholic Foundation are leading men in this community and province-- and outstanding men. They along with the medical advisory committee and the directors have set the policies of the foundation. At no time said the medical advisory committee can we allow Nassau House to become a drying-out centre for acute alcoholic. It is not the half-way house; if we do we destroy our rehabilitation of the alcoholic. Alcoholism must be divided into¹ roughly, prevention, treatment of the acute state and rehabilitation of the person concerned. He further pointed out that only when a person had reached a stage of coming out of the first stage of alcoholism should they be-- they should be what he called dried-out or over the acute stage before, and have a sincere desire to stop drinking-- that they should come into Nassau House, which is the place where he gains confidence, where he can have counselling service and where he can be rehabilitated back into the community. And that was the reason for taking a rather quiet street and in a respectable district in order to get this hominess and friendliness and casualness imparted -- rubbing off on the man who has this desire.

Now for those who say Nassau House has been a waste of money for \$5,600.00 per year, as the Medical Advisory Committee and the director pointed out to me, we have rehabilitated seventeen men; we have rehabilitated four families. Maybe our policy said the Board, on speaking to them only a month ago, when they came to see me, maybe our policy has been a little too rigid. We're going to have another look at this. But the Medical Advisory Committee said no, we must stick to our guns, we must have this respected as the place where a man who comes in the door, he's ready for rehabilitation; he has a sincere desire to forget it; to get on the right track. To allow a man in there with a bottle according to the Provincial Psychiatrist would be disastrous. I would point out that in the Annual Report the committee pointed out that 87.23% of those who came in contact with Nassau House and the Foundation had connection with Alcoholics Anonymous. 47% of the referral to Nassau House came from the Acute Hospital where these men had gone for acute treatment of the acute phase. 2% came from the clergy. There were 2,500 referrals and consultations carried out by these three men in Nassau House.

Now I want to make it perfectly clear that whenever we talk on this subject of alcoholism we're in this very intangible field that's hard to define; it's a field where we, I am not defending the policy of Nassau House I am merely trying to look at it objectively and to go over the budget with the group. However, I had misgivings when I saw it empty the same as anyone else would, but when this was explained to me I had more compassion for their objectives. The Foundation tell me that they have an educational program and this is true. They send a little treatment digest booklet out to every physician in rural Manitoba, and in the city, to try and educate the doctors with this problem; what the Foundations feels or how the Foundation feels

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) a physician should handle the acute stage and when they should send this patient in for rehabilitation. This is a very, as you can appreciate, difficult problem. According to the director when people or transients come to the Foundation looking for help if he feels there is that -- he is highly trained in this field -- if he feels there is that ring of sincerity that the man wants and needs help he admits him to Nassau House. Very often it's not that clear, in which case he says he has always, if necessary given the person a slip to take to the Salvation Army for a bed for the night, and they've worked in close association with the hostel, or he would send him -- give him a cheque to go to the YMCA. These are the type who are sort of over the acute stage, but -- the ready for rehabilitation, or just passing through. Therefore their welfare costs have not been great in the past year. But the Board is looking at this policy also they are thinking more now of getting a part-time medical practitioner to work with the foundation on a half-day basis. Up until now they have utilized five or six physicians in the Greater Winnipeg area, who are extremely interested in this field and who are very understanding and they've had excellent success with them and the reason why the Bill is so low is because very often, the foundation director told me, the physician concerned has neglected to send in an account. He feels for this reason they should possibly have a part-time director.

Now as I say during the discussions in the newspapers and so on and with my slight knowledge of the activities of the Foundation I convened a meeting with the members of the Board in my office, and brought these matters up very frankly and asked them what their opinion was. Of course, I received the answers that I have passed on to you that they do have this large number of people coming in for consultation, they do have these various activities going on, they can make, and do make a very stout defence of their policy of Nassau House and I am afraid one has to agree that this should be the policy of this type of home. However, they informed me that they would take a good look at this whole matter. Therefore, I feel that while we are in the, as I pointed out, it's just a little over a year that the House first opened and they do have a very excellent group of citizens steering this foundation, that we felt that this estimate should be passed for this year.

MR. GRAY: This is no criticism, at all, of those groups who are contributing in the prevention, education and rehabilitation of alcoholics. I am also more interested in education and prevention than rehabilitation, although rehabilitation is very important. My complaint is only one, how can you expect to do a job on the small amount in the estimates on all these three sections. After all, I'm going to repeat the very same thing that I've said before, that having an industry so to speak, that brings us in \$12,000,000.00. The original idea of the province taking over the Liquor Control years ago is for one purpose only, not so much for the profit because the profit is very small at the early years, but for the purpose of liquor control, it's still called liquor control and not liquor sales. Now when the profits have grown, the consumption of liquor in the province has grown, I understand it's over \$50,000,000.00 last year for a population of nearly a little over 800,000. I think it's too much money spent entirely. Whereas we try to control it, we try to prevent it, we try to cure it, we try to rehabilitate, we try to tell our youth the danger of liquor. Never mind us we are we can't help us anymore those who our age take a drink, but. . . .

A MEMBER: We're beyond the hill, eh?

MR. GRAY: Probably behind the hill. . . . but it seems possible so there's not criticism of the Department at all, no criticism of the--all groups that are doing a good work. My complaint is, having such a tremendous amount of revenue out of this Liquor Control I believe that little bit more money should be spent for this or for all the three sections, namely rehabilitation, education and prevention. This is my only complaint -- I spoke twice on this already I tried to have my third strike and if we have any gamblers in the House they could bet the result of my third strike.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30, I shall leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.