

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 25, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees:

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources dated March 25, 1966.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg me to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session, the quorum of this Committee shall consist of nine members. Your Committee met on Tuesday, March 8, 1966; on Thursday, March 10, 1966; on Monday, March 21, 1966 and on Friday, March 25, 1966.

Mr. D. M. Stephens, Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, addressed the Committee on the subject of the Nelson River Project. Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from Mr. Stephens and the officials of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric and their staff with respect to matters pertaining to the subject under discussion. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

Your Committee has examined the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the year ending March 31, 1965.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the officers of the Manitoba Hydro and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the report and business of this Utility. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to tell the members of the House that the next meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will be held at 11 o'clock next Monday, to hear members of the Manitoba Telephone System.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: What properties on Edmonton and Kennedy Streets, Winnipeg, between York and Assiniboine, belong to the Province, and in connection with each: (a) What are the dates of acquisition? (b) By what method was each acquired? (c) What prices were paid? (d) From whom were they acquired? (e) What was the frontage and depth of each parcel?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): can be accepted subject to the usual reservations in case any matters should still be under negotiation. I have no information as to whether they are or not, but subject to that one reservation the Order is acceptable.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I think perhaps the appropriate time has arrived for me to make some comments concerning Bill No. 7 which proposes to make certain amendments to The Summary Convictions Act. I say that, because the new Highway Traffic Act which has a bearing on the provisions of this bill - the operation of this bill - has now been for some time before the Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety, and I believe is nearing completion of consideration.

Madam Speaker, in discussing this bill I will perhaps come close to offending against the rules of debate, because I want to deal with the historical background of this in order to place it in its proper perspective. And while I am often told that logic doesn't really have much bearing sometimes in parliamentary debates, I do want to set this matter in what I consider to be its proper perspective, before its consideration. And I may have to - indeed I would propose to - refer to specific sections of other statutes because it has a bearing on the consideration of this matter which is before us in the form of this bill.

Essentially, we considered the principle involved in this bill last year when certain amendments to The Summary Convictions Act were before the House, and what is proposed in Bill No. 7 now before the members really is amendments which do not affect the principle that was agreed to last year. I say that simply again so that it will be quite clearly understood, and I have no objection of course to the principle involved being discussed, but really the principle involved is not a principle that finds its place in this bill per se, but rather was in the legislation which was before the members a year ago.

In the City of Winnipeg, by virtue of the provisions of the Winnipeg Charter, certain by-law offences having to do with traffic were -- by reason of the provisions in the Winnipeg Charter it was possible for matters, contraventions of the bylaw to be dealt with without the necessity of laying a charge against the persons concerned. The most obvious and perhaps the best illustration of that was the provisions respecting traffic tickets where, if one overparked at a meter a matter of a minute of an hour, it was possible for the motorist to dispose of the matter without the necessity of a formal charge; and that was done under the provisions of the Winnipeg Charter. In addition, we have reason to believe that in other parts of the province where towns or cities have for example, parking bylaws, that the same procedure was being followed although there is some doubt as to the legal authority for that being done.

Then the next development was a regulation made through the matter of the Department of Public Works respecting parking on the legislative grounds, in particular on the legislative grounds although I believe that the regulation applied to what one might call improper or unauthorized parking on the grounds of properties belonging to the Province of Manitoba and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works. And a regulation was made prohibiting parking and imposing certain penalties. That regulation came to the attention of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and that Committee recommended adversely on that regulation, pointing out that it was doubtful that the legislative authority existed for such a regulation. The matter subsequently was then referred to the Law Reform Committee who were asked to consider what would be the proper steps to follow as a result of the report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and the Law Reform Committee, having considered the matter, recommended that legislation on the basis of the bill which was before the members a year ago should be enacted in order to regularize and provide for the situations which were contemplated; in particular it was brought to our attention by the regulations having to do with parking on public Province of Manitoba grounds. Hence the provisions of the bill which was considered by the members a year ago and which found its way into our statutes as Chapter 77 of the Statutes of 1965 and which enacted Section 4 (a) of The Summary Convictions Act; and it's here that the principle comes into play.

This bill said that if an Act of the Legislature authorized this procedure to be in force, it would be permissible for a person who had been notified that he had committed a violation of the statute concerned, that he might appear voluntarily without an information being laid and pay the penalty. It also was made applicable to bylaws dealing with the same matter, and two important aspects to that provision were, first, that the Legislature had to say by way of an enactment where this procedure was applicable; and secondly, providing for a voluntary appearance by a person who had violated a bylaw or statutory provision, and the payment of the penalty without the necessity of a formal charge being laid.

I think if I may just interject in my comments at this point to say that that provision; in

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . principle, it seems to me was a perfectly obvious one. I really find it difficult to accept the theory of those who opted - who say that every person who violates any provision must formally appear in court and be charged and so on, because that really would seem to be unnecessary. After all, if I overparked at a meter, I know that I do; it isn't a matter where one ought to be put to the procedure of having to formally appear in court, be charged and that sort of thing. And perhaps the same comment would apply to other matters of a similar nature. So I would be inclined to think that the balance of convenience, the balance of convenience lay with the principle of the procedure that was indicated.

It becomes necessary then -- Oh, perhaps I should go one step further and say that we overlooked a matter in the bill last year having to do with the question of to whom the fines paid under this arrangement, this voluntary arrangement, would be remitted. And indeed the legislation made it appear, and said that they were to be paid to the Provincial Treasurer, while in actual fact, of course, under bylaws, normally the fines were paid to the municipal corporation concerned and under certain provisions of The Highway Traffic Act the fines are paid to the municipality, and therefore we were reversing the procedure with respect to the remitting of fines to the detriment of certain municipal corporations. When the Legislature had risen, this defect in the legislation - which we had overlooked, I must say, completely - was brought to our attention with the result that we asked that the voluntary procedure as provided for under that legislation be not used until we had an opportunity of bringing in the necessary correcting legislation, and the correcting legislation is what is before the House at this time, making quite clear as to the matter of remitting the fines that would be paid, the penalties that would be paid under this voluntary procedure.

Now, having said that, it becomes necessary to look at and see to what provisions of the law does this procedure apply, because after all that's the test, in my opinion. How does it work, or with respect to what does it work, because it's meaningless, in my opinion, to talk in theoretical terms about some situation which doesn't exist. We must, I think, direct our attention to the provisions which are applicable under this procedure.

Well, as the law stands at the present time, this voluntary procedure applies, or would apply, to a list of 40 items that are set out in The Highway Traffic Act, and these were brought in, again at our Session a year ago, by way of what is now Section 105 (d) of The Highway Traffic Act, and that would be found in Chapter 33 of the amendments to The Highway Traffic Act of 1965. That provision lists 40 items in respect of which the voluntary arrangements would operate. I will not read them because that would only take unnecessary time, but members will note that in large measure the items listed are what might be called non-moving contraventions of The Highway Traffic Act. For example, just to give Item No. 1 from last year's legislation: "Failure to register motor vehicle for current registration year." That would be, under these arrangements, an offence for which one might appear voluntarily without an information being laid and pay the penalty involved; and so they continue.

Item No. 40 in the list set out in last year's legislation referred to "an offence under any regulation or bylaw made or passed under the authority of this Act." - that meaning The Highway Traffic Act, and it is under that provision that certain bylaws having to do with highway traffic might be passed by municipal corporations, and members will find the authority for that, that is to say the authority of the municipal corporation, in Section 61, subsection (6) of The Highway Traffic Act. I'm speaking of the present Highway Traffic Act. So the one instance, not the one type of violation but the one authority for using Section 4 (a) then, existed and exists under this section of The Highway Traffic Act.

The second authority under which it could be used was found again in an amendment of last year to The Public Works Act, and members may refer to Sections 24 and 25 where they will find complementary legislation, and there again that was to deal, in the case of the Department of Public Works and public buildings, with the situation which had been attempted to be dealt with under the regulation which had come to the attention of the Regulations Committee and the Law Reform Committee, and which in effect led to the legislation which was brought before the House last year, so that there then exists at the present moment only two statutes, two statutory provisions, in which this voluntary procedure is applicable: one in The Highway Traffic Act and the second in The Public Works Act, and until and unless the Legislature accepts other legislation which would make it applicable, it is limited to those two provisions.

Now, to carry the matter further and in order to have as much detail on record as possible, because there is before the members and before the Committee on Highway Safety,

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) Bill No. 5 which proposes to amend -- or it's really a consolidation and a new Highway Traffic Act, and if the members will refer to Section 221 of Bill No. 5 they will find there listed the provisions under which this voluntary procedure may be applicable, and I point out that whereas there were 40 listed in the present legislation, there are 17 items set out in Section 221 of The Highway Traffic Act or the bill which is presently under consideration by the Legislature and by the Committee. And here again, I make the same general comment that these are what are normally known as non-moving contraventions of the Act, and I just pick one out at random; for example: "Failure to notify a change in address of owner". That would be one violation under which a person could voluntarily appear and pay the penalty without having an information laid.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Pardon me, what section is that?

MR. McLEAN: Section 221 of Bill No. 5.

The seventeenth item in Section 221 of Bill No. 5 refers to the regulations made by a municipal corporation, and again it's the same principle as is in the present legislation.

So I think with that background that it would be possible to consider the bill that is presently before us, and I wish I knew how to say this, but I believe, and indeed when discussing the present bill, the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party said, "We should make it as convenient as possible," referring to people who may have; in some inadvertently -- or otherwise contravened a municipal bylaw having to do with matters of this sort, I presume under The Highway Traffic Act, and that is what is designed; that's what we've endeavoured to do by this basic legislation, to make it convenient for those who find that they have committed a violation of these matters to which I have referred under The Highway Traffic Act which carries with it certain municipal bylaw offences which are related to traffic and also, of course, to this matter of parking on public grounds, grounds belonging to the public, to the Province of Manitoba. I simply put it to the members that I can't conceive that we should really seriously suggest that everybody who finds they have violated one or other of these provisions ought to be haled into court in a formal way for the purpose of disposing of the charge, and when I say that, I recognize of course that one could advance the opposite opinion and that's good debating ground. I just am doubtful of how seriously anyone wishes to push that theory under modern-day circumstances.

Now there is one other thing that is in this bill, however, that is a departure from last year. In the normal course, a person who contravenes is charged with an offence under The Highway Traffic Act, certain offences under The Highway Traffic Act, and is convicted. That matter is reported to the Motor Vehicle Branch and is recorded against the driving record of the person concerned, and it has certain consequences, certain possible consequences, in the possible loss of driving privileges, perhaps an effect upon one's automobile insurance and other matters, and these are of course, as all of us recognize, much more serious in their effect upon the driver or owner of the motor vehicle oftentimes than the penalty that may be imposed in the Court. The penalty, as I have often said when I practised law and many times since, is nothing compared, for example, to the possibility that a person's driving license may be cancelled or suspended, and this is the system under which we operate at the present time.

Now, when introducing last year the provisions for the voluntary payment, we did not say that where a voluntary payment was made that the matter would be reported to the Motor Vehicle Branch, and so two situations exist under the present law -- two possibilities. One is a charge in which an information is laid and the person appears in court, and, if convicted, the matter is reported to the Motor Vehicle Branch and may have certain other consequences depending on the circumstances. If on the other hand it was one of the violations for which a person could appear voluntarily and pay a penalty, then no report is made to the Motor Vehicle Branch and they would not have any knowledge of it having occurred.

One of the provisions in the bill this year would require that reports be made to the Motor Vehicle Branch in the case of a voluntary payment of a penalty, on the same basis as though there had been a conviction in court; in other words, that the voluntary payment would have the same effect in relation to the reports to the Motor Vehicle Branch as would occur if there were formal charges laid and formal convictions. There are two lines of reasoning here, but I presume that one could argue that if the violation was such a one as would require a report if a person were formally convicted, then perhaps there is an argument for saying that the same report should be made if he voluntarily appears and pays the fine, or the penalty. On the other hand, there is the argument that perhaps voluntary payments of penalties would be treated somewhat casually by drivers; they might not appreciate the significance of what they

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . were doing. So I would say to the members, Madam Speaker, that I myself -- and I have an open mind on this, and if in Committee the members feel that this is contrary to good practice and that the reports ought not to be made, then certainly I would have no objection if the Committee feels it ought to be removed from the bill. I point out, of course, I point out that one has to consider justice from both sides and one might need, in practice, to shore up and ensure that people didn't escape reports being made in proper cases simply because they availed themselves of the voluntary payment of penalty arrangement, because I think that we would recognize, much and all as some of us find it difficult, we recognize the importance of keeping accurate records of traffic violations for the purpose of safety and the enforcement of the law. But I say, simply, that I approach this matter with an open mind and I don't regard it as a matter of great moment, in a sense, that it remain in if the members of the Committee think it ought to come out.

Now dealing with just a few of the comments - and we're coming back now to the general principle of this bill, which does deal with this whole question of the principle involved in the voluntary payments - I notice that the Honourable the Member for Rhineland said, "Is this a good thing for the people of Manitoba?" He was really saying, well ought they not all to appear in court and be formally charged? Well I put forward the contrary view, and he said that too many people were being advised to plead guilty. Well, that is a separate problem and does not become involved in this. The person who is going to be persuaded to plead guilty, he's just as likely to be persuaded to plead guilty under present arrangements as he is under this new arrangement, and I deplore it just as much as anyone else. I don't know whether it happens as often as is suggested, and when I practiced law I used to think it happened too often, but I'm the first one to say that basically everyone charged with any offence ought to say "not guilty". That's clear. That's our right, and it's one which I would advise anyone to adopt, but of course one has to be practical and if, in fact, I'm driving 70 miles an hour and I know that, I don't know that there's really any practical benefit to exercising my right to enter a plea of "not guilty", except perhaps to put me to some embarrassment in having the facts proved against me, but there is no question that people are entitled to plead not guilty and that they ought not to be persuaded to plead guilty by people who have responsibilities for law enforcement. If they are persuaded that way by their own lawyers or by their friends or their families, that's another matter, but that is separate and apart from this arrangement, because as I say, it can happen just as easily, if it happens at all, under the present arrangement as it would under the arrangements that are set out here.

The Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa developed the same point, and he said it would encourage people to plead guilty, and why should we do that; and I reject that theory because I know that it can happen now and does happen now, and I don't think that the legislation alters that situation.

The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party said we were moving away from the original intention of the legislation, and I'm assuming, my recollection is he was referring to this matter of reporting to the Motor Vehicles Branch the violations that have to be reported, and I've made my comment with respect to that matter. Then he went on to say that we should make it as convenient as possible and that is what the legislation is designed to do.

The Honourable Member for Emerson said the bill was ill-timed - and along about then I was inclined to agree with him - and he wanted to wait until the new Highway Traffic Act was before the members. As I indicated, I was quite prepared to have that done and it has now been before the members and the Committee.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface said we were putting the cart before the horse and he wanted to see the Highway Traffic Act -- and really that deals with the same point.

I would point out, Madam Speaker, that the Law Amendments Committee will meet on Tuesday. If by some fortunate combination of circumstances this bill receives second reading, we can consider it in Law Amendments Committee. The Highways Safety Committee will be meeting at 8:30 on Wednesday morning, and I believe that that committee is very close to the Section 221 which is the comparable or the companion feature, as it were, to the legislation that is involved here, and I think that we are now to the point where we may give consideration in committee to these matters. But I do recommend the principle involved, namely, as a matter of public convenience and in respect of certain violations, that there ought to be this provision for voluntary payments without the necessity of formal charges being laid.

There was another matter which really didn't receive any consideration in the debate on

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . this bill, but I just remind members that there is a provision in this bill which is totally unrelated, of course, to the matter I have just been discussing, and that is with respect to suspended sentences. I just remind the members that I indicated that this was a provision in The Summary Convictions Act which is a companion feature to The Corrections Act, in making it quite clear the authority for imposing suspended sentences, and I'm assuming that members will not object to that authority being abundantly clear.

I wish to draw to the attention that we will have some minor amendments to propose in committee with respect to this item because it has been drawn to my attention that we perhaps inadvertently don't have the correct wording, but it doesn't change the principle involved -- it's a matter of drafting; that is, members of the staff have brought it to my attention and we will be discussing that when we are in committee.

Madam Speaker, in closing the debate on Bill No. 7, I would recommend the bill to the House, ask that it receive the support of the House on second reading, and say that we will be more than happy to discuss the matter that I have indicated in committee in the Law Amendments Committee and in the Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? When we were discussing this bill several days ago, it was understood that the sitting Committee on Statutory regulations would replace the Law Amendments Committee insofar as going through this bill is concerned. Has that been changed now, and will this bill come before the Law Amendments Committee in the usual manner?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I don't recall saying anything about the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee as far as Bill No. 7 is concerned. If I did, I had always assumed that it went to the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, could I be permitted a question from the Honourable Minister? In view of the fact that I have counted what I consider to be moving violations, 26 out of the 40 in Section 105 (d), and if they have the effect on a driver's license, and if the committee should persuade the Minister to eliminate this reporting for driver's license purposes, would not the Crown have the right to decide whether to permit a voluntary payment or lay an information in order that the report should be made if the Crown or the police, in their wisdom, think that this should be recorded?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if I may answer the question, the answer to that question is yes.

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

MR. MOLGAT: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House - the second reading of Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson, Klym, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26, Nays 14.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 37. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): May we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 71. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I would like to have this matter stand.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): presented Bill No. 72, An Act respecting Embalmers and Funeral Directors, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, in explaining the principle behind the bill, at the present time when we're dealing with embalming, embalmers are governed by regulations under The Department of Health Act and we have been utilizing the services of the funeral directors in the province in aiding us in the administration of these regulations.

(MR. WITNEY, cont'd)

There have been some changes over the past few years with respect to embalming. It is now possible to go to schools outside of the Province of Manitoba where the trade of embalming can be learned, but apparently the regulations are not clear as to whether or not the embalmers, when they come back into this province, will be able to obtain a license for embalming unless they have gone through a period of apprenticeship. So the funeral directors have a very direct interest in embalming and so has the Department of Health, because there is a definite health aspect to embalming particularly when embalming bodies that have been affected by a communicable disease.

What we are setting up in the Act is a board appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. That board will have funeral directors; it will be chaired by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Health, and it makes provision for the public.

There is another aspect to embalming which we feel is of concern to us at the present time, that while we can license the embalmers we do not have any supervision over the facilities that the embalmers use, and when you are dealing with the communicable disease aspect there is a definite concern for public health. So this board would also have the responsibility of laying down some regulations which would be applied to the funeral homes where the embalming process was done; and then of course there would be the authority of the license in order to make sure that the regulations were carried out.

Thus the bill in respect provides for the funeral directors; it provides for the embalmers; it provides for the Department of Health; and I believe it is in the best interests of the province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I have been conducting a sort of a personal study on methods of restrictions in licensing, and I read this bill, and except for the fact that the board is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, I see this bill as being a protective one for the industry and restrictive as against new applicants who want to be licensed under this Act. I think the only safeguard would be the manner in which the persons are selected who will sit on the board, and this of course would be up to the government but I suspect it would include people who are now in the business. And I say that because I'm under the impression that this aspect of the business is a pretty tightly-knit group insofar as new people coming into it are concerned.

Now, the board has the power to establish regulations which will affect the qualifications of persons, which involve, I think, the need for a person to serve under Articles, which means a form of apprenticeship. The principle is not wrong but the power is given to the board and not in the Act as to the length of time to be served and what other restrictions there are. Well, there is a provision that if a person has been elsewhere than in Manitoba apparently he has to have served for five years. Now I don't really know why it's necessary for a five-year apprenticeship for this work.

The other thing that I do not see in this Act is an appeal provision as far as the decision of the board is concerned, and it seems to me that it is advisable always to have an appeal provided from decisions of a board even though it be a board vested with powers given to it by the Act and appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Once the board is appointed it's on its own, and since it's on its own I think that its consideration ought to be subject to review by another body. Now it may be here but I have not seen it. I confess that I have not searched each section thoroughly, but I have not seen an appeal provision, so that by all means the licensing could be considered but the restrictive features and the protective features I think have to be looked at carefully in Committee.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, if I may just comment briefly on the points raised - I gather I am closing the debate - by the honourable member. The appeal section in the bill is Section 12 subsection (5) where it allows for an appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench.

On the matter of protective and restrictive, we feel that the bill actually will aid to open up the situation because of the fact that we have a board that will be comprised of government, funeral directors and the public. The bill will also provide for those people who have been out to recognized schools to learn the art of embalming.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I direct a question, Madam Speaker. As I read 12 (5), that refers only to a revocation or suspension. I do not see that there is any appeal from the application for the granting of a certificate which seems to be under 13. Is there an appeal from the refusal to grant a certificate in the first instance?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to just clarify that and it can be dealt with in Committee at that time.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that Madam 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.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, before you put the question, I have a grievance here which I would like to place before the House for the consideration of the Legislature.

As we all know, again this spring, as happened last year, the residents of the Red River Valley have been subjected to another flood scare. We may have a flood or we may not have a flood. We may be lucky as we were last spring, but - and rightly so - the officials are advising the people to be prepared in this area. The farmer in this threatened area between Emerson, through Morden, all the way through Ste. Agathe, were advised by the Flood Committee to deliver their grain to the elevator of their choice for sale or for storage, as the case may be. Now, by the Wheat Board special consideration was given to the farmers living in this area by increasing their grain quota to 10 bushels per acre, and the farmers appreciate this very much. But June 15, 1966, was set as post-flood - we can call it - safety date, and on that day the farmer will be required to repossess or take delivery of any grain in excess of the 10-bushel quota which was permitted them. The farmers in that area have been complaining to me that on this portion of the grain above the 10-bushel quota the farmer would have to pay storage charges for the period involved - it may be two months or three months or whatever it may be. On top of that the farmer will be required, not by the Wheat Board but by the elevator, to pay the elevation charges in an out. That's an added expense.

Now there's a further expense, a great expense which would involve the handling of this grain three times instead of once, as usually is. And I'm bringing this matter up in this Legislature in the hope that this grievance be brought before the Flood Committee who in turn possibly could discuss this with the Wheat Board, whereby maybe the Wheat Board could make a further concession and probably permit - or maybe the Federal Government may be involved with this - permit the Wheat Board to keep the excess grain in the elevator or keep possession of it. The farmers they tell me that they are not interested in getting paid for this extra portion of the grain that they'll deliver immediately. They'll be willing to wait until the quota is raised sufficiently and their turn comes. They're not interested in that but they would like to avoid extra expense, and to me it seems surely that the Wheat Board is big enough to be able to make this special extra concession to this small area in time of emergency. To me it seems that the area in relation to the whole region under the Wheat Board is very very insignificant. Therefore I would like to hear maybe some other comments on this. Maybe the Minister has

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Derville): Madam Speaker, all of the points that I heard mentioned by the Honourable Member for Emerson were covered in a joint meeting of the Canadian Wheat Board, the elevator companies and the railway-companies, which was held in the Legislative Building last week.

I think one has to appreciate the situation in respect to the handling of grain. Canada is under commitment to deliver some 600 million bushels of grain into the export trade this year. There's a real pinch in the availability of railway equipment, and I think that we can be very appreciative of the way that the railways have responded to the emergency that we have in the Red River Valley.

The Canadian Wheat Board also anticipates that they will not be able to raise the delivery quotas in any of these points above 10-bushels to the acre in this crop year, regardless of the flood or not. But they have raised them here prematurely in order that the farmers who have to take precautionary measures against the potential flood could get the maximum amount of grain into the elevators and not be encumbered with this commitment or onus to take the grain out. So we do know that at least 10 bushels per acre of the deliverable grain can be put into the elevator and left there.

Now it's true that the balance will have to be taken out. The date has been set as the 15th of June by the Canadian Wheat Board. Now this will again depend a great deal on what materializes between now and the 15th of June. It could be - and the Canadian Wheat Board suggested that it could be - that due to conditions in the Valley, etc., at that time, that the date on which the farmer would have to take delivery of his grain again might be postponed. They have not

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd) . . . taken an absolutely dogmatic position on it. But on the other hand they didn't want to be committed at this time, and so the farmer must understand that when he puts his grain, if he delivers over and above the quota of 10 bushels, into the elevator, he is at least at this time, it is with the understanding that he'll be asked to remove it at the 15th of June. Now if circumstances develop such that there would be a hardship in the removal of the grain at that date, then I think the Canadian Wheat Board would entertain a proposal to extend that date.

Now the question of the charges at the elevator, I must say are entirely the business of the elevator companies, and I think that it is not our place, not my place, to suggest to these elevator companies that they make special provision. A fact of the matter is that the Manitoba Pool Elevators, a farmer-owned organization, has by far the greatest number of elevators in this area and I have sufficient confidence in the management of the Manitoba Pool Elevators to believe that they will do what's right by their own producers. I do know that last year when we were faced with the same situation and the farmers delivered grain into the elevators. I do know that the elevator companies did make some concessions. But this is their business and, as I say, I believe that the management of the Manitoba Pool Elevators and the United Grain Growers and these two farmer-owned organizations certainly know best what to do for their own people in this regard. And there is no doubt in my mind that the other elevator companies, the line elevator companies, would join with them in offering the same service and the same concessions to their patrons.

I cannot complain about the action of the elevator companies. I think it would be most ungracious at this time in view of the tremendous co-operation that they have extended to us. The Richardson people, for instance, made special provision to extend their tenure of the terminal at Transcona for no other reason than to accommodate and to help the farmers in the flood plain of the Red River Valley. This terminal will hold something close to a million bushels of grain, and I can't say anything but "Thank you" to these people for the steps that they have taken. And it's a little - well, I just feel a little sad that this matter should have been raised in this manner today in such a way as to intimate that the elevators, the Canadian Wheat Board, and the railways were doing less than they could to help the farmers who are threatened in this area. I know that, I have complete confidence that the railways will do everything in their power; I believe that the elevators are doing everything in their power; I am quite prepared to leave the question of how they treat their patrons, their members, their owners in many cases, how they will treat them in regard to the cost. I think this is not a matter for the Legislature or for the Minister of Agriculture to take action on, and I think that rather than complaints and criticism at this stage, we should be extending some measure of gratefulness to them for the way they have co-operated in meeting this situation.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I would like to tell the Honourable Minister that I did not criticize anybody; it wasn't critical. I simply brought the grievance up and I did not criticize the Wheat Board, the elevators and everything. They had no alternative but to do it and there was no criticism, and I reject what the Honourable Minister has just said, that I criticized.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I was very much surprised at the attitude of the Honourable Minister because certainly nobody is criticizing the Wheat Board, the railways or the elevator companies. In fact, if anything, they are to be commended for what they have done. The Honourable Minister well knows that and knows that there is no criticism of them. But in his usual way of placing somebody on the spot, he will twist the remarks of those made by anybody in this House to his own advantage. I don't think it's fair and I think it's just about high time that the Honourable Minister stopped using that type of strategy. What is being asked for, Madam Speaker, is simply that the privileges that have been given be extended. And there is good and sufficient reason for this, Madam Speaker. As the matter now stands, the people in this area are permitted to deliver all the grain in their granaries to the elevators; that is, in order to stop the grain from becoming spoiled in the event that the flood waters reach the granaries. When the combination of the Wheat Board, the railways and the elevators have agreed that they can accommodate the farmers to this degree, it simply means that they have the capacity to take the grain in; but if they haven't got the capacity in the local elevators, then evidently they're going to move it elsewhere. And once they move it elsewhere, they're certainly not going to bring it back to the elevators.

Now most of these elevators, if not all of them, are on the quota system for the farmers located in this area. The end of the crop year is August 1st, or a matter of six weeks from

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd) . . . the deadline of June 15th that has been set. There is one thing that can be done without dislocating the quota system, I would suggest, Madam Speaker, and that is that immediately after August 1st, or within a very short time after August 1st, the farmers are allowed to deliver the initial quota - and it doesn't have to be of the new crop; it can be of the grain that they've had in storage throughout the years. I don't know whether this point has been raised and discussed with the Wheat Board. There may be other points that we don't see at the moment, but the attitude of the Honourable Minister is absolutely contrary to anything that's in the interests of anybody that's concerned here. Surely the Honourable Minister could have raised this particular question. Maybe the Wheat Board would be prepared to take the initial quota from the following crop year. There may be other things. It wouldn't hurt him a bit to ask for these concessions. We realize that it means extra work; we realize that this is a privilege extended; but it's a privilege that is based on an emergency. The farmers haven't asked for this; it was suggested to them. And properly so. Because the farmers not only stand to lose a lot of grain in this area - this is a heavy grain-producing area - but our export trade may require this grain. And I think that the attitude of the Honourable Minister is absolutely wrong. He should take the attitude that he'll do what he can to extend this. The farmers are prepared to pay for the storage charges. Surely, surely it's not unreasonable to make a request. If the Wheat Board and the railway companies and the elevator companies find that they cannot possibly extend the privilege, well, that's that. But if they can, it would be just too bad that they didn't because we failed to ask for it.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, at 10 o'clock last night we were discussing some of the problems of The Social Allowances Act and the reason for some of the misunderstanding and confusion that seems to persist in the public's mind. Even the Honourable Minister made a statement - I have it here somewhere - and he says that his plan has been completely misunderstood. So I am sure that he agrees that there is certainly misunderstanding. I said that probably - last night, that some of the misunderstanding stems from the fact that there are so many yardsticks used in various agencies for determining what in fact is the basic need of an individual or a family, and I cited under The Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons Allowance Act that a married man could qualify for assistance under that Act if his income was less than \$2,220.00. I also cited a case where - that my honourable friend determines that a family, a married man under exactly the same circumstances, was not entitled to Medicare because they - that is the government - had established his needs at \$100, or \$1,200. Now there is a \$1,000 a year discrepancy in those two cases. A \$1,000 a year discrepancy in those two cases.

Then I also cited a letter that I had received from the Family Bureau in which they set out what they consider to be the minimum basic needs of a family. And the needs established in the unorganized and the disorganized areas of the province, they use another yardstick. I have since last evening acquired another yardstick based on a submission of the YWCA to the Minimum Wage Board a year or two ago in which they set out what they consider to be the needs of a single girl living away from home; and they put it at \$1,781.24 as the minimum on which they could get by on. So this just points up again that if we could somehow or other adopt one yardstick that we could apply to all of the various agencies, that we may be getting somewhere.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that this morning my honourable friend would lay on the members' desks a new regulation and a new schedule of payments under the Social Allowance Act so that there would be no confusion and we'd all know what we were talking about, because when this legislation was introduced about six years ago, we were supplied with the regulations and the schedule of payments, and unless my filing system has been upset, I have not yet received a supplementary schedule, in the last six years I have not received a new schedule of payments.

Mr. Chairman, this is the one that we received, I think it was in February 1960, Schedule A Regulation under the Social Allowances Act and part 3 of the Child Welfare Act and so on, setting out in detail the method used to arrive at the basic needs of individuals and

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) ...families. Now I wonder is my honourable friend going to distribute to the members a new revised schedule, because surely, Mr. Chairman, I don't need to remind the House that in the interval, in the last six years, that the cost of living has risen drastically in every field, the cost of a pair of boots, the cost of eating, the cost of your room and board and every other single item you buy has gone up drastically since these regulations were handed to us six years ago.

Now I referred last evening to an article written by Val Werier in February 26th last month, and Mr. Werier says that the province provides Medicare to the indigent and to the aged as long as their income is below a certain limit. If his living expenses calculated on the standard basic rates under the Social Allowances Act are \$69 or less, he does not receive Medicare. Is this a true statement? He does not receive Medicare if his living expenses calculated on the standard basic rates under the Social Allowances Act are \$69 or less, he does not receive Medicare, that's what he says here. I question that - I wonder if my honourable friend would care to answer that.

I wonder too, Mr. Chairman, whether or not this situation has changed since we last met. I'm in receipt here of a letter from the Department of Welfare and it just says in part "In assessing eligibility for Medicare, it is our practice to enroll those applicants whose income is within \$5.00 of their expenses as determined by our own scale." What does that mean? Has it changed since then?

Mr. Chairman, there's another matter - I think that there are very few, thank heavens, very few cases of multiple sclerosis, in the province - there is one in Neepawa. And about two years ago, well for many years, for quite a number of years this family was in receipt of total disability pension, under the Total Disability Act and the wife was receiving a - I suppose you could call it a Widow's Allowance in consideration of the fact that the breadwinner of the family was unable to earn any money. He was cut off of this total disability pension and then the family naturally came to me to see what could be done? Now in this particular case they immediately started paying him under Social Allowance and they, since his needs or their needs were established under the Total Disability Branch, the Social Allowances Branch had to pay exactly the same amount of money, because if they didn't they were in trouble; and in this case they did pay it, exactly the same. But why was there a transfer there?

During this Session, during this Session, Mr. Chairman, a lady phoned me who lives in the City of Winnipeg. She is a graduate nurse and she says, she refers to a case - she has a great deal to do with these home care patients and she sets out what she considers to be a great injustice in the whole welfare program. She refers to a case where the husband has multiple sclerosis - similar to the one that we have in Neepawa - and he is confined to his home. His wife has just graduated as a practical nurse and she has obtained a position at the Children's Hospital and will attempt to provide for her husband and two daughters that are aged 9 and 11. She says if the lady of the house was the multiple sclerosis victim, the home care would provide a homemaker while the husband was at work, but because of the fact that it is he that has it they won't do that; and yet she is going out, the wife is going out, trying to maintain the home. It seems to me that this is completely wrong, completely wrong. I don't know how many more cases there are in the city like this: -- (Interjection)-- there's plenty he says. Well it's wrong. The principle is wrong here, completely

Mr. Chairman, this is only a little incident it is true, but I think it should be brought to the attention of my honourable friends. In our office we occupy part of the premises owned by the Hotel, the annex of a hotel. There was a fellow came in one very, very stormy night - a chap from Mafeking was on his way into Winnipeg at the request of the department for a medical examination to determine his physical position in respect to Social Allowance I suppose, and they said as usual, they were quite prepared to pay his bus fare in to Winnipeg and back again. That's normal for them to do that. But he got a ride with a fellow from Swan River or Mafeking into Neepawa and spent the night there. To save my honourable friend and the taxpayers some money, he was getting a ride into Winnipeg - they wouldn't pay the hotel bill of \$2.00. They wouldn't pay his hotel bill for \$2 or \$3 and it's still unpaid. Here's a fellow that's trying to co-operate to the extent of saving the government a little bit of money and they don't want to co-operate. Well surely this kind of thing can be ironed out somewhere.

My honourable friend was saying last night that every recipient of Social Allowance was getting a Medicare card; and I'm glad to know that. But I would like to know this, Mr. Chairman, how many people in the Province of Manitoba are now exempt from paying their hospital premiums? The last figure that I had was something in the neighborhood of 45,000. It

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . may have increased in the last year or so. It was about 45,000. Now the number of persons that are in receipt of Medicare, I think is about half that number, about half that number. Now why is there a discrepancy there? If we have 45,000 people in the province that have been established that they cannot afford to pay their hospital premium then why are they not getting Medicare cards?

I don't know whether the figures are closer together than they were two or three years ago, but there was double, and this was the point that I was trying to raise. You have twice as many people exempt from hospital premium as you have that are in receipt of Medicare, and there seems to be something drastically wrong there.

Here is a case in the Town of Neepawa where -- I cited one or two last night where they had taken away their Medicare cards - here's a case here where my honourable friend says they do not qualify for Medicare because, according to their estimate, this family who are both very, very sickly and require a lot of medication, but their income exceeds their outgo by \$7.58 a month, that's what they say in this letter, "and we urge you to consider enrolling yourself on Manitoba Medical Service." If you've got the Plan that I've got, you can't do it for that much money. You cannot buy the best - Mr. Chairman, you cannot buy a plan as good as the Medicare Plan. We as individuals cannot buy a plan anywhere nearby as good as Medicare because Medicare covers the four - covers the doctor, the dentist, and the denturist probably, and optical and prescribed drugs. But in this particular case, my honourable friend says you are - according to us, you're \$7.58 a month over what we think you need and you go and buy your own hospital plan. Exactly what they say, and it can't be done. So it's no wonder my honourable friend that is in the hospital today says they are a penny pinching bunch of so and so's. I think that's what he said. Because this is ridiculous. I'm going to check over the weekend and I'm going to put that in my pocket right now and check and see whether the conditions have altered in the last year. I'll check with them on the weekend.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to know when my honourable friend gets up, if the policy has changed in respect to the amount of property that people can hold and qualify for social allowance. On April 20th last year I wrote to my honourable friend in respect to a lady in my constituency because I had been approached by the Reeve of the R. M. of Westbourne that the Department of Welfare were going to suspend this widow's social allowance. She has a large family and I say that I understand that your department is considering suspension of her social allowance on the grounds that she presently is the owner of certain farm lands. This land in my opinion is very sub-marginal and the income from it is very limited. Since social allowances are paid on the basis of need, it is difficult to understand why your department would want Mrs. So - and - so to dispose of her land. Surely if the revenue from the land helps to reduce the amount of social allowance that she needs, it would only be common sense to allow her to maintain any meagre income that she derives from her holdings. This is my own letter, so there is nothing wrong with reading my own letter, but I still think that I've got a very, very valid point there.

Apparently, my honourable friend is saying no we can't pay any social allowance because you've got this semi-marginal farm and if it brings in \$50 or \$60 a month and reduces your social allowances accordingly, that's not in keeping with our program. Well that seems to me to be a little ridiculous. So I would like my honourable friend to explain that one.

I would like to know, too, the minimum amount of cash social allowance that is paid today. Is it still \$2.00. I've got several in my constituency that are getting \$2.00. What they are saying is we've gone out and assessed your needs and it looks like - that you're getting \$75.00 from your Old Age Pension, and according to our test, you need \$76.93, so if we give you \$1.93 everything will be fine and dandy. Well, would he pay that person \$2.00? That's the question, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my honourable friend would like to answer some of the questions that has been put to him and I will certainly look forward to receiving the new regulations and the new schedule of payments in respect to social allowance so that we will know what we're talking about when we're talking about the various regulations and the schedule of payments under it. Surely it has been brought up-to-date since 1960. It was on February 19th, 1960 that we received the only one that I have.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, we can certainly provide the member with the regulations but I rather suspect that no one can guarantee that he's going to know what he's talking about when he's talking about social allowances, because I think in his mind somehow or other he's managed to confuse The Social Allowances Act which he voted for in 1959 with all of the

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) . . . other kinds of assistance that people can get and he seems to pretty successfully confuse it with the three categorical programs over which we in this province have no control at all. I'm thinking of Old Age Assistance, Blind Persons' Allowances and Disability Allowances. These are essentially federally-sponsored programs. The determination of eligibility is based on rules that are made in Ottawa and have to be adopted by us and therefore become part of the program that we administer. But this is not a needs-based program. Social Allowances is. And then in order to add confusion into it he takes all those cases that are beyond social allowances and beyond these three categorical programs, the municipal case load, and says well of course, they have different standards too, therefore this government is doing a terrible thing by confusing the public on really what social allowances are all about. And I really think the whole problem here is that there is very little appreciation of what this program is trying to do for the people of Manitoba.

The young lady that wrote to him a short while ago, asked him for advice. She said "What is this all about? Where can I go for assistance?" And her case was rather simple. She was apparently deserted by her husband a few months ago; she found it necessary to return to her home in Gladstone; she got a separation from her husband in January of this year and she said "Who am I to go to for assistance?" Well my honourable friend knows very well that the short term desertion cases are the responsibility of the municipality. In our letter to him at that time we said that it looked to us as though this - from the copy of the letter that she had sent to him and had been supplied us - we said it looks very much like a municipal case. If she isn't getting sufficient from the municipality we have no power to direct the municipality to pay more. If we go back a few years it was his government that said this is the way really all allowances should be paid. They are the people in the best position to know what the needs of their local citizens are. Well, here is a case where a girl was getting some assistance from the municipality which she considered to be inadequate and she came to her member and said "Can you direct me? Can you give me some direction here? Can you tell me what the problems are?" - and I think my honourable friend hasn't really been of very much help to her.

The answer's quite simple. But in addition to what we said - we weren't sure we had the facts straight so we said that in addition to suggesting that this was probably a municipal case we would be quite prepared to go out and have a look, meet her and find out whether there is any other assistance that could be provided, any advice that might be given to her, etcetera.

So I think if there is confusion it is largely in the mind of the Member for Gladstone who fails to understand that Social Allowances is an Act that is based on the principle of trying to assess individual needs. It may be possible for one couple to come who can get along nicely on \$1,000 a year and - another couple getting twice that much may still be in need, in spite of the fact that they are getting twice as much money, because the needs-based program isn't based on the income of the individuals alone; it assesses the income in relation to what their actual needs are. This is what we have to take into account and this is why it's a program that has a very high service component in it because we do have to deal with people individually and look at their problems individually and provide many other kinds of assistance besides the financial assistance that's given to them by way of a cheque or the kind of assistance we give by way of a Medicare program.

Now we are trying to improve the service with respect to cases of desertion, wives that have been abandoned by their husbands, neglecting their responsibilities for their families and things of this kind. We are proposing to establish three family counsellors to be located in various parts of the province to try to give personal on-the-spot advice and guidance to families who find themselves in this position, and attempt to try to reconcile where that's possible, try to bring the family back together, and in that respect it's a preventive program; and try to effect a reconciliation if that's possible. So this is one of the areas in which we will be working. In addition to that there will be a beefing up of the enforcement staff. Here in the City of Winnipeg they'll be working very closely with the Attorney-General's Department. We aren't sure at the moment exactly where that staff will be located but they will be following husbands who have abandoned their responsibilities in an effort to try to get them to face up to their responsibilities and provide some kind of support to the family itself.

With respect to the Family Bureau budget, I did happen to have one in my Estimate Book last night when the Member for Gladstone was speaking on this subject. I don't want to quarrel with this budget but I do wish the members who are interested would take out their pens and pencils and jot down a few figures here. In looking at this budget I'm not going to

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) . . . discuss all of the items in it - but I think there are items included in this budget which would not likely be included in a budget for people who are on public assistance. I think there are some things included in here that would not likely be included in a normal budget where we attempt to meet the minimum requirements of the family without very many of the extras which are normally included.

To begin with there's an item here for bus fare - it's marked \$9.00. I think we might well note that particular item. That doesn't mean we don't make some allowance for bus fare, because we do; but I want you to note that item and list it with a group of others. Now we have an item here for drugs. It's only \$1.00 but you should put that down because if a person is on assistance, on Social Allowance, he's going to get a Medicare card and he won't need that \$1.00 item. You would also note \$5.00 under dental because he's going to get his teeth fixed in addition to that.

Now we go on to a number of other items. We'll leave the item for cigarettes in of \$8.00. We've got an item here of coffee at work, \$4.40. He's not going to be at work, he won't need that \$4.00. We're going to take out the baby-sitter item, a \$1.40. I recognize that under certain conditions a baby-sitter may be a necessity but I think we'll eliminate that at the moment. We've got three items here, one includes show or other entertainment, presumably; newspapers, magazines and other clubs, a total of \$6.00. I think we should just note the item. Gifts here \$3.00 - we'll just note that item too. Work contributions, in other words donations given at work would not be required - 50 cents. Savings, \$5.00. I think we should note that item. Vacation, \$5.00. I suppose we should note that item too. Then the final item is hospital, \$4.00. He won't need that because he's going to be getting free hospitalization if he's being supported by the Province of Manitoba.

Now if you want to add those figures up, I think it might be fairly interesting. --(Interjection) -- No, you didn't add very accurately I'm afraid if that's the figure. --(Interjection) -- How much?

..... continued on next page

MR. SHOEMAKER: On the first page you've taken off \$15.00, right? And on the next page you've taken off \$4.40, \$1.40, 50 cents

MR. CARROLL: No, you missed the \$6.00 item - three items of \$2.00 each.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh you're going to take - you're not going to let him go to a show or have magazines

MR. CARROLL: I say we should just note those items, that's all, just note,

MR. SHOEMAKER: You're not going to take them off though?

MR. CARROLL: I'm going to take them off my initial

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh, you are going to take them off? He can't go to a show and he can't read papers and he can't do anything else? What is your final calculation then?

MR. CARROLL: I think you'll find - now incidentally, these are just items that I say that we would sort of question. I don't say we are going to take them off.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, how much are you going - I want to get this down because this is pretty good stuff for the election. What are you going to come up with, that's the answer. I mean if you're going to disagree with a fellow you might as well disagree with him and let us know exactly

MR. CARROLL: Let's throw in the \$8.00 cigarette item, and then we're going to come back and give him some personal contribution; let's throw in children's allowances and a few others and then we'll give him something back, eh, at the end?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, what are you going to give him?

MR. CARROLL: You do your homework there and then we'll come back to it, eh?

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, - I'm not going to quarrel with this. I worked this out on the basis of what is possible under our Social Allowances Program and I find that our allowance isn't really very much off what has been included in this item here. To begin with our Social Allowances Program - and this is something the Committee should know - we are not allowed to take into account Family Allowances. In this particular family that item would amount to \$24.00. We're not allowed to because it's spelled out in the Federal Statutes.

Something else that may not be generally known, I don't know, is the fact that we do build into our - for long-term cases, \$150.00 a year for special needs of a family. This might be to replace family furniture; it might be to effect repairs on the house, things of this kind - providing they are living in their own house of course.

If you build in all of these extra items I think you will find that the budget suggested by the Family Bureau is very very close to what people get under our Social Allowances program. In fact the calculation I made this morning showed it possible for the person to receive slightly more under a Social Allowance program than they would under this - taking into account all of these things here. Now when I say this, I'm not saying that we have a generous Social Allowance program. I think that a person living on Social Allowances has to run a very tight budget if they are to get along well. But I say again, it is possible to get along on our Social Allowances budget. It doesn't provide a great many frills and yet I know many people who live on it who seem to do quite well. There are others of course who are accused of abusing their allowances and these are normally the kinds of complaints that are raised in this House. But generally speaking, I think most people put their budgets to good use and their children get along well on it.

Now the question of Medicare cards came up and the suggestion was - at least the question that was asked the other day, was can MMS pay chiropractors for service under the Medicare program. And the reason they can't, of course, is that our arrangement with the medical association is that all payments that go to doctors are paid through MMS and they in turn reimburse doctors for the services they perform. And doctors of course as you know are making a contribution toward this program; they aren't getting 100 percent reimbursement but they are making a contribution on behalf of their own association. Now we have agreements with dentists, with pharmacists, with ophthalmic dispensers, with optometrists and we do have arrangements made whereby chiropractors get service under this program as well.

Now in addition to all of these things, in addition to all of these things, we have many other programs that have health components in them -- and I'm thinking of things like visiting nurses, the homemaker services that were raised here this morning, and many other programs of this kind -- foster homes for elderly people, for instance. And of course, special care homes and meals on wheels, and these kinds of program whereby people are getting special health needs in addition to the needs provided by the Medicare card itself. --(Interjection)-- The denturists do not have an arrangement with the government. In fact, as I understand the

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). situation at the present time, the denturists are not operating legally within the Province of Manitoba.

Copies of the regulations. I don't know when they were handed out last. I am sure my honourable friend gets the Manitoba Gazette. He obviously isn't much interested in what it had to say about changes in our regulations with respect to Medicare recipients or he might have got them. In any case, I have a copy here

MR. SHOEMAKER: Would you supply every member with a

MR. CARROLL: I'll supply you because you've specifically asked. Any other member that wants one, I'll be very happy to send one around.

Incidentally, I will be happy for any advice that members may have with respect to the regulations that you have before you there now, or We have the whole question of allowances or scale of grants under review at the present time. There is an item in these Estimates that will provide for some changes in this scale of grants and, as I say we have it under review. If some of you have any specific advice on this subject, we would be very happy to hear your views on it.

Now with respect to this multiple sclerosis case that was cut off disability allowance, here again we are dealing with one of these three categorical programs. The Government of Canada makes all of the rules under that program and if the board, the medical panel that assess these cases say that the person doesn't qualify any longer for disability allowance, then I suppose the chairman who administers these allowances has no alternative but to cut them off, because they no longer qualify. But this really is a regulation over which, as I said earlier, we have no control. The fact that he was still in need, his need wasn't being met when he was cut off disability allowance, he was then subsequently enrolled on Social Allowances and is now presumably continuing to receive service under that program.

I'd be very happy to get the information with respect to the gentleman from Mafeking who was refused hospital bill, which - or hotel bill in his attempt to save the Province money. I'd be very pleased to look into that case personally for him and find out if anything can be done. I am quite sure that the government are reasonable about these things as a rule and would be quite happy to look at ways and means of saving money in transporting people to areas where they are going to be assessed for eligibility.

With respect to the hospital premium exemption category, again we are dealing with this confusion between the categorical programs and the qualifications for Medicare. Under the Hospital Services Act, the eligibility - it was spelled out that the eligibility for hospital premium exemption would be exactly the same as that used for Old Age Assistance. So here again we have a means test based program - a means test based premium exemption. It doesn't take into account the needs of the individual at all. It says if a person has no more than so much money, by way of annual income then he qualifies, regardless of his needs, he qualifies for this premium exemption; and here again we have this confusion being entered in.

The fact that there are only half that many, or whatever the figure happens to be, getting Medicare, is accounted for by virtue of the fact that these people are the only ones who qualify for need under the philosophy of Social Allowances. And incidentally, the scale of grants under Social Allowances is the same whether you live in Winnipeg or Brandon or Neepawa or in unorganized territory or local government districts the same scale of grants applies; the same test is applied; and the same allowances are granted in the event that the person has a need which is not being met. The only reason, of course, people with excess assets - we allow a person who - if they are living on a farm and they are in need, then of course they can apply and receive Social Allowances. If they have property in excess of their home quarter, if they have a farm down the road a mile or so that may be providing some income to the family, we say well this is an excess asset, one which could be sold, could bring in a cash return which the family should use to maintain themselves and if their circumstances change after that and they require assistance on the part of the government, then they come to us at that stage for support. We have a great many people owning small pieces of property around the city or around a town, that for sentimental reasons they don't want to sell. And yet I don't think that the government can be in the position of allowing people to be fairly large property owners, but because they have no income then they can come to us for support and not be required to give up their interest in these other properties. Now in some cases where there is no ready sale for the excess asset, then an allowance can be paid with a Lien filed against that property. This is one of the few cases in which a Lien would be filed on a property. But we wouldn't leave the person without some means of financial support, providing they were willing

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....to divest themselves of what was considered to be excess assets under the provisions of this particular Act.

I think these are most of the points that were raised by the Member for Gladstone. I am afraid I can't tell him - I rather suspect that \$2 is still the smallest cash allowance that's paid out. I don't know, I'll find out whether there are some made which are smaller than that.

With respect to the multiple sclerosis patient being denied home care, I'd be very happy to look into that particular case to find out whether our policy is right in this area; whether in fact it is our policy or whether it might be some other program under which this decision was made; but we'd be glad to try to look into it for him and I'd be happy if he could provide any further details on that point for us.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Honourable Minister for his replies. There are still two or three that he has not answered. I notice on the regulations that were tabled in the House on February 1960, that recipients of allowances may earn up to \$20 per month without a reduction in the amount of government assistance. Does this still hold? And then I haven't actually had the chance to compare the regulations and schedule of payments of 1960 to those that he just handed to me, but on the front page, it's quite evident that the basic amounts are down. They're down. On the schedule of payment of 1960, under food, the single adult or the first adult in a family of two beneficiaries, \$23 a month; they are now down to \$20, according to the regulations. They're down \$3; and so on, all the way down. I can't understand that. But I would particularly like to know whether it's still quite in order for a recipient of Social Allowance to go out and earn up to \$20 a month without affecting his Social Allowance.

MR. CARROLL: want the House to think, or the Committee to think that food allowances have gone down. Food allowances have in effect gone up and if he reads the regulations carefully, I think he'll probably find that to be the case. It is still possible for a recipient, under our program, to earn some money in addition to his allowance here. But remember, these are mostly the long term welfare cases, the aged, the infirm, the Mother's Allowance cases, unemployables -- there is very little opportunity for most of the categories that are covered in here to actually effect any earning capacity - that have any earning capacity of any size.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, because I am going to be critical, I would like to start off by giving some credit. I want to say to the Minister how much I appreciate the work that his Department does. I have had occasion to refer several cases to his assistants and because, Mr. Chairman, that not all the cases are genuine, this happens from time to time because we are not trained to question people perhaps the way a trained social worker could; but they realize that we do this with the most sincere desire to help these people.

Now I would like to stick to the Social Allowances Act, Mr. Chairman, because I want to base my case on it. And not long ago, Mr. Val Werier - I think this was just recently - February 26, 1966, had an article in the Winnipeg Tribune; it was entitled: "Manitoba Medicare has Limits" -- and of course everything has limits, and that doesn't mean too much. But when one reads it, you can well understand what he is getting at. I want to emphasize what he says here because we have been saying this repeatedly, that once you get a Medicare card, then you are treated very well.

I read from Mr. Werier's article, and I quote: "He says that once the door is opened for a needy person to Medicare, the provisions are very broad. He obtains full medical and hospital coverage, dental and optical care, any costs that go with it for false teeth or eye-glasses, drugs, transportation, if required, to and from medical care. But this door is shut to many aged people who live only on their \$75 a month. Welfare officials estimate this number must run into hundreds and possibly to thousands. In Manitoba today approximately 10,800 of the aged receive Medicare and of these, 9,300 receive Medicare plus Social Allowance. The remaining 1,500 receive Medicare only. He says the population of those 65 and over in Manitoba in the 1961 census was 83,288. The number has increased by thousands since. He says we are still dealing with an elderly group that has come out of the depression with little in the way of pensions and a great deal of pride." He's quoting a welfare official when he's using these last sentences. "Many of these people undoubtedly are not getting the medical care they require and they can't afford it. It doesn't make sense that an elderly person living on \$75.00 a month doesn't automatically qualify for Medicare. The fact that he doesn't qualify negates the avowed philosophy of the Social Allowances Act, that everyone in Manitoba will be assured

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd). . . . of the basic necessities of life."

I read that, Mr. Chairman, because I intend to enlarge on this. I have said that I knew of an elderly lady, who is 82, who has \$75.00 per month. That's her sole income, and out of the \$75.00, because she is living with relatives who are good to her, she manages to pay her MMS premium which is around some \$15.00 per quarter, and yet this lady cannot get the drugs that she so badly needs. This seems to be the only type of care that she really needs, so with a limit of \$75.00 and the tenacity to stick to and try to manage her own way and by paying this premium, she still hasn't the right to qualify. People have been sent there and they figure that because the daughter is so good to her mother, that her needs are not so great. This is where I wanted to fight with this matter of the needs test.

I have another case of an elderly lady living in a senior citizens development in West Kildonan. I have mentioned this every year, Mr. Chairman, that this senior citizens development in West Kildonan is the only privately-owned one in Canada, and I have said this before. It was built by a new Canadian who found this a wonderful country in which to live and he wanted to do something for the country, and under the limited dividend plan he put up 10% of the money and built a fine place in West Kildonan. Now, he doesn't qualify under the Elderly Persons Housing Act to a grant, and therefore the rents there are higher than elsewhere in Winnipeg. He feels very badly about this, although the place is filled, and he offered to have his lawyer arrange an agreement whereby any money that could be paid to him by this government under The Elderly Persons Housing Act would be used for the sole purpose of reducing these rents. He hasn't been able to accomplish this; therefore the rents there are a little higher.

The lady in question, which we will call Mrs. X - I have occasion to see her quite often - she is 83 years of age, and I asked the Department to look into it and they did, and they were very, very good and I have no quarrel to find with the administration in any way at all but I do want to fight with the principle and with the regulations. The report I got was this, that, "Mrs. X has been receiving social allowances to supplement her old age security pension since January 1, 1962. The difficulty here is that Anatole Park has no single units and therefore any single person living there must pay the rent of \$55.00, whereas under our present regulations the maximum single rate we can allow is \$35.00. Of course when Mrs. X first took up residence in Anatole Park her husband was living and has since died. She apparently is most reluctant to take up residence elsewhere and this is a decision which must rest with her. In any event, she is getting the maximum amount of assistance which we can provide under our present regulations. I trust this will explain the situation to you."

I found out that the amount that she does get is \$3.25. That gives her an income now of \$78.25 and she pays the \$55.00 a month rent. Well I asked the department, where were they going to move this lady? They suggested that she move. Where does a lady 83 years of age move to? We just recently closed an area we were ashamed of; we boarded it all up waiting for urban renewal. She lived there with her husband and when he passed away she found herself quite lonely but she was living with friends - they have lived there some two or three years. Where do you ask a person like this to move to? Had the government been willing to give Mrs. Bosenko a grant under The Elderly Persons Housing Act, a grant which would have been used by agreement for the sole purpose of reducing the rent, this could have ameliorated the situation somewhat. Well, this lady now, because she is living with friends and because she has to pay this \$55.00, and I know, younger people can, as we say, bunk together, but a lady 83 years of age must be guaranteed some dignity in this life and some privacy, and I suggest it's quite difficult at that age to adjust yourself to living with other people or moving out of the area completely. This leaves this lady \$23.25 for the month.

I saw a cartoon in one of the papers last night where the man and wife were wheeling a cart, a shopping cart into the supermarket filled with dollar bills, and on the way out the gentleman in question had a little parcel on one finger. We all know that the cost of living to-day has gone up a lot.

Now in looking at the regulation, Mr. Chairman, the one that I had originally, I think it was 1960, for food it said a single adult or the first adult in the family of two beneficiaries, \$23.00 a month; and then it said each adult after the first in a family of two or more, \$20.00 a month. Well in the regulations we have today, food is still \$20.00 a month for each adult, but there is a note down here farther down where if the household unit consists of three or less beneficiaries the following additions shall be made: for a single person \$5.00 a month, so I imagine now that it is \$25.00 a month instead of \$23.00. Well that's \$2.00 in all these years.

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....

Now, when you figure the cost of a meal, assuming that the lady only eats twice a day, it will still cost around 40¢ per meal, and assuming at this age that you probably need to have a snack in between and you figure three meals, you get it down to 26 cents a meal. Now is that the intent of the Social Allowances Act? As I said, I'm not quarrelling with the Act, when a person finally gets a Medicare card. In fact, the Department has gone overboard to -- I shouldn't say overboard, I should commend them on it. They have issued a pamphlet, Health Care Services, a little card which informs people of the dental services available, the optical services, the drugs, the hospitals and the hours at which you can get these things. It mentions, as the honourable member said, about chiropractic service where recommended by a doctor. It tells them about the important points to remember about the care they are getting, and this is good. But I think we are missing the boat with this great area of grey where people are left out. I don't believe that the people of Manitoba want to be this small about it. I can't see why the Department can't provide this lady with a little extra allowance, because under the Social Allowances Act the actual rent can be paid where a person is living in an approved housing accommodation under the Elderly Persons Housing Act, and I think if the rent were say, \$40.00, the \$40.00 could be paid.

There is also another stipulation here that where the heat is part of the rent, I believe an additional \$10.00 can be paid, so that the \$35.00 could be stepped up to \$45.00 there in the case of this lady, so that leaves a difference now - we're arguing over a difference between \$55.00 and \$45.00.

I say, Mr. Chairman, there's a difference in a person 65 to 70 and one that's 83, and I want to quarrel with the regulations that forbids the department to do anything about this. As I say, it's not her fault that she's living in the only privately-owned development in Canada. She can't help that. People who live in some of the other approved ones, like the Kiwanis or Lions and that, are enjoying lower rent because of a contribution by this government. Then what is so wrong about this government making a contribution to help this lady who is unfortunate enough to live in this development? I don't think that we want to ask people 83 years of age to have to figure out her meals by 26 cents per meal. There should be some dignity when one reaches the age of 83 years.

Now Mr. Chairman, I picked up a pamphlet here to the Royal Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association by Dr. Trueman. He pointed out certain things in regard to Medicare. He said that, "furthermore, it was recommended that these extended benefits apply to those old age pensioners and old age assistance groups who presently receive waiver of their hospital services from premiums by use of a means test." We have in the province today municipalities paying the hospital services premium for many people, and yet these same people cannot qualify for a Medicare card, and this seems rather strange. It seems strange to me that a lady over 80, that her sole income is \$75.00 that she cannot be reason of being 83 years of age and by reason of having only \$75.00 per month, acquire a Medicare card, and I think this is one of the weaknesses. However the regulations don't permit it.

I think that the changing of the regulations is a job for this Legislature. I think that the regulations are being administered fairly and very capably by the department, but I do want to emphasize again that we are interested in this periphery group of people who are so close to getting Medicare cards. Surely we can take another look at this after having this Act in force now, or many parts of it since 1960, and I submit that to make a payment of \$3.25 a month to an elderly lady 83 years of age, who is just trying to end the sunset days of her life in some dignity, certainly demands from this government a far deeper look.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Minister and his Deputy Ministers and everybody that works with him. This is going to be a little bit different from what you have heard all the way through. I have gone to him several times and I have had co-operation, and I was quite pleased because it shows that he is on the job and trying to do the best he can under the circumstances. I wouldn't have his job for all the money in the world, because everybody comes to him and he's like a man with a little bit of money in his pocket - how much am I going to give away? How much am I going to give away? He hasn't got that much money to give away. We the people in this Chamber are the ones that gives him the money to give away, but no; we say oh I want this, I want that, but when it comes down to paying for it, who's going to pay the taxes? Who's going to pay the taxes? Then they are all looking around - who's going to pay the taxes? We the people here in Manitoba pay the taxes. Not only that, but I say the senior government should hand out more, should come down from

(MR. HARRIS cont'd).....the top to the grass roots, that's what I say; and then you can do something for your people. You are on a tight schedule in your own department. I know that and I can appreciate what you have to go through, and I would like to get more for the people that come to me, but I understand your position too. So I say, it's no use to cry to the one man. Let's see what we can do all the way through for these people, and if things are not done right, the man is there to rectify them, so he goes according to his schedule, I'll say that, and I'm to police what he does for my constituents, and if I don't think that he's not doing right, I'll come to him and I'll tell him so, but I expect an answer back from him and I expect him to do things for me. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): No, Mr. Chairman, isn't he going to answer the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. CARROLL: I'm not going to quarrel with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I think he raises a good point with respect to a specific case. It's always difficult to argue special cases particularly where you have a person in a particular environment and conditions there which she is very reluctant to change. I think we can appreciate that. I'm not sure that maybe we can't have another look at this. I would be very happy to do that. I'm not sure that we're going to be able to solve the problem but at least we'll be prepared to look at that again.

With respect to the question of Medicare and whether or not we're too strict in our application of this - I think that we do try to include all of those people who actually have a demonstrated need for health services that can't be met from their present allowance. Many of them fear the day when they will have a need and are unable to meet that. I think this is a legitimate concern that they have. We try to move in quickly when their circumstances do change and I think for most people this is one of the most valuable parts of the total welfare program in the Province of Manitoba.

I think that's really all I have to say at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Allow me to put this on the record, please. In quoting Dr. Trueman's report here I would like to say that the Medical Association asked Professor Clarence Barber, Professor of Economics and Sociology at the University of Manitoba to prepare a study of minimum family earnings required to cover basic living costs, given the accepted standard and attitudes of this country. Details as to the basis on which these estimates were prepared are given in appendix to the Supplementary Brief Table 1. The data presented are for urban residents of Manitoba. Quoting from this appendix prepared by Professor Barber, he has reached the following conclusions: "These data suggest that individuals and families in urban areas of Manitoba whose incomes are below the following levels require some subsidization in order to meet the costs of comprehensive medical care." And he starts off by "One Adult, \$1,400," that is for one adult. "Two adults, \$2,000; two adults and three children, \$2,800; two adults and five children, \$3,700.00." Now this is the result of a careful study and I just want to remind the Honourable Minister again that here we have a lady here with \$939 total income in a year, whereas Professor Barber suggests that you have to have \$1,400 in order to be able to pay for the kind of medical care that they should have.

MR. CARROLL: The only comment I can make is that in many cases the suggested incomes of Professor Barber will be most inadequate to meet the needs of families. In other cases they of course may be more than generous, depending on individual circumstances. It's pretty hard to generalize in this whole area. I think we try to do the best we can in the policy we've got. I think in some cases there is hardship. Where that happens I think if any member has a special case where he thinks it isn't being dealt with properly, we are quite prepared at any time to look at these cases again to see whether maybe we can accommodate them in some other way.

MR. SHOEMAKER: As my honourable friend is quite well aware, the Manitoba Hospital Plan provides for limited care until the doctor, who is incidentally the adjuster, determines that you no longer require the chronic bed attention and then you are expected to leave that bed and move to one in which you pay for, if you have the means.

I have had a very lengthy discussion with a lady in Winnipeg and received two long letters from her and it seems to me that she has a very valid point. Her father is 98 years of age. I'm sure my honourable friend knows of the case of which I speak - I do not intend to mention any names - but it has been suggested to her that it's time her father left this hospital bed and was transferred to a convalescent home. I am informed that her father, who is now 98, in those 98 years has been able to save two or three thousand dollars. - I think he has left something

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....like two or three thousand dollars. If this chap would like to stay in this chronic, which is costing \$24.00 a day, will it be in order for him to use -- let us assume that he's got \$2,000, you're going to leave him with burial money of \$1,000, I believe, something like that -- then if he uses the \$1,000 to pay the \$24.00 a day for his bed he'll have about enough money left to pay for oh, what? - about 50 days. He'll have enough money for 50 days. The entire family feel that there isn't a convalescent home in Winnipeg that's really prepared to look after him because of his condition. The people from Neepawa that are in this condition have in the past been taken care of at the Assiniboine Hospital and I think they're closing the Assiniboine Hospital; or have they already done that? And if this chap, this 98 year old, could get accommodation in the Assiniboine Hospital in Brandon, it wouldn't cost him anything. His care would be covered under the Plan. So it seems to me that there is not only confusion in The Social Allowances Act, there is confusion under this aspect of Welfare as well.

Apparently this lady had a look at a convalescent home that was recommended to her and on examination she found that it only contained 75 square feet, - a room 15 by 5, or space - he was allotted space, 5 by 15. Is this the minimum amount that my honourable friend considers adequate for convalescent homes or nursing homes or alternative care homes, call them what you like? What are the minimum requirements? Is it possible in this day and age for an individual or a firm or a corporation to obtain a permit to build a convalescent home or to convert an old home into one; and if so what are the requirements for registration and alteration and accommodation? What's the whole "dope," to put it plain, in respect to this?

In Neepawa we have a private home that has accommodation, I believe, for four patients. She operates a very clean, tidy, little home and I understand that she is only allowed \$3.00 and some odd cents a day per patient in this home by the Department of Welfare. Now we have this type of accommodation apparently that is made available to certain people, at say \$3.50 a day and we have other accommodation that costs the taxpayer \$24.00 a day, so I often wonder whether or not we should pursue the advisability of allowing more people to build accommodation for convalescents or alternative care homes, and license to operate. If an individual, or firm or corporation are able to do a better job for less, should we pursue this a little further. I think it's very worthwhile considering.

I would like to know how many hospitals that we have in Manitoba similar to the Assiniboine Home in Brandon, that is where the cost of care is paid for completely under the Manitoba Hospital Commission. Perhaps my honourable friend in the two or three minutes that are left could answer two or three of these questions.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think I would prefer not to comment on the hospital aspects of this, as this comes under the Department of Health and is not really within our area of responsibility.

With respect to the standards for nursing homes or personal care homes, it is true that there are certain minimum standards that have been raised since this government took over. I'm not sure of the exact number of square feet that are required per patient, but it has been increased in any case in recent months.

I think we have a bit of a problem here, particularly in the Metropolitan area at the present time. There is a shortage of personal care homes, personal care beds within Metropolitan Winnipeg. We have made provision in our Estimates and in the change in the Act, The Elderly and Infirm Persons Housing Act to enable us to expand further in this field this year, some of which will be providing new beds; others which will be a replacement of some pretty inadequate accommodation in this field at the present time.

I think we are reluctant to encourage the conversion of more older homes to personal care homes. I think we find that most of these have pretty substantial deficiencies that really are difficult to overcome by way of renovation. However there has been some expansion in the proprietary kind of home; we have three very large new ones that have extended in this area in recent years and I understand that there may be further extension in the future.

I think about the only caution that we give them is that we will not guarantee that public patients will be put into those homes once they are completed and a great many of these people rely pretty heavily on public patients to maintain their homes because we find that about two-thirds or more of patients in private nursing homes are being supported by the public treasury, so that we have a pretty big interest in these private homes because we do carry a large share of the financial responsibility for them.

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).....

I don't know what rate is being allowed at Neepawa at the present time; I don't think any of the rates that we're paying in personal care homes are as low as \$3.50. I think he'll find on examination that it is probably somewhat different from that figure. The allowance that we make to these homes is based on the kind of care that they are giving in the home; we have them graded according to heavy care and the staffing required to provide this kind of care to patients who reside there. The next category is medium care; and of course the final one being for patients that require very little by way of skilled nursing care in the home. I think that generally speaking is some comment at least on the questions that were raised by the Member for Gladstone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed; (b) passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I have another matter or two to raise. One is that about every time I see - Did you want to call it 12:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 12:30 and I leave the Chair until 2:30.