



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Volume IV No. 32

March 2, 1960

2nd Session, 26th Legislature

DAILY INDEX

Wednesday, March 2, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 107, re Parks (Mr. Witney)</u>	1135
<u>Motion of Urgent Importance: Mr. Prefontaine</u>	1136
<u>Committee of Supply: Health and Public Welfare, Welfare Division</u>	1141

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 2nd, 1960

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Committee of the Whole House

HON. C. H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

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

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

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting Provincial Parks and Provincial Recreational Areas and to provide, among other matters, for the purchase of expropriation of land required for that purpose and the exchange of lands already owned by the Crown for lands in a proposed park or area, and for the leasing of lands in such parks and areas and the issue of occupational permits in respect thereof.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, at the present time the recreational areas of the province are administered under two acts, The Forest Act and The Crown Lands Act. Since we have had such intensive utilization of the forest areas and crown land areas for recreational purposes such as Falcon Lake, we deem it expedient to provide better jurisdiction through the provision of another Act. The province has expended considerable monies in these recreational areas such as the Whiteshell and the Falcon Lake area and it is felt advisable from the experience that we have had to bring in an Act which will allow some more jurisdiction in those areas.

We are also, Mr. Speaker, are now operating our recreational areas under two directors of our Department of Mines & Natural Resources under lands and under forests, and this will facilitate the bringing of the recreational development under one branch, and also allow the public at large instead of having to deal with two branches to deal with the one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would think that the proposal as the Minister has outlined it is a good idea because certainly I think it would be advisable to have administration centered in one department. I presume by the fact that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is bringing in the Bill that it will be in his department that it is to be centered.

I would like to give the Honourable the Minister notice now -- I do not intend to debate it at this time because I think that would be, if not out of order, it would be a questionable procedure at least, but I would like to give him notice now that when the Bill comes forward I would like to get him, ask him to consider this question of leasing the lands in such parks and areas of outright sale under some condition rather than leasing. I think that's a question with which he's very familiar coming from the district that he does. I raised it last year; I'd like to raise it again for consideration.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, would this include roadside parks and also roads leading to these various recreational areas if they are within crown lands or lands owned by the crown?

MR. WITNEY: Yes.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee he received.

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

MR. WITNEY introduced Bill No. 107, An Act respecting Provincial Parks and Provincial Recreational Areas.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 11 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring the attention of the House to a group of students from the Machray School in my constituency who are seated in the gallery to your left. They are here with their teacher Miss Reimer, and I am certain that all the members of the House would want to join with me in expressing our pleasure in having them here and hoping that they will learn something of how our democratic way works while they are visiting here.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities in regard to the TV link to the north. Is it true that an article appearing in the Free Press -- I will just read that short article which will put my question in the proper manner: "Using Mr. Carroll's figures Mr. Molgat said we are forced to the conclusion that the Manitoba Telephone System would not only write off the entire costs of the network in fifteen years but at the same time build up a cash reserve of \$1,300,000 which in could build a new network.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. CORBETT: I would ask the Minister if there is any truth in that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. You may not base a question on a newspaper article. Orders of the Day.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that the House be now adjourned for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the hardship being experienced by many Manitoba farmers due to the delay of the Government of Canada in meeting its commitments with regard to payments of compensation for cattle slaughtered under the brucellosis eradication program and the desirability of the Government of Manitoba petitioning the Government of Canada to take immediate action in this respect.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that I'm

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before you give your decision as to whether this motion is in order at the present time. We are in a difficult situation in this House at the moment, where the Rules Committee as I understand it has considered and will be bringing in a recommendation -- in fact the draft is in our hands -- making it definite in this House that the matter itself must have direct urgency that cannot wait for another proper occasion within the House to discuss the matter concerning which the motion is put. I have always believed and I think it is only right that occasions of this kind should be reserved for matters of such urgency that they cannot wait for that other occasion to turn up when they would be properly discussed. It would seem to me also that motions of this kind should be reserved for matters within the jurisdiction of this House and that anything else is of the nature of discussing something about which we cannot take direct action and for that reason cannot alleviate any condition about which there is urgency. I would ask you therefore Mr. Speaker, to consider these points in rendering your decision. It would seem to me that the honourable member has at his disposal the opportunity to introduce a resolution on this subject if it is a matter that he wishes to have discussed in this House calling for some form of direct action or some concern of this House to consider while the session is on.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to state that although this matter has been before the Committee studying rules and proceedings that there is no change in the rule as now. And as far as the other suggestion, that it is not within the realm of the Province of Manitoba, I stated in my preamble that I suggest that it would be desirable that this government should take action. This is a very important matter for many farmers of this province. It is of great urgency. It is most relevant to members of this Legislature and

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd)...I am sure that after the members have heard a story that I will tell the House now they will agree with me that some farmers are suffering great hardship because of the delay in paying compensation for reactors. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely along the lines of the practice that has been followed in this House, and I suggest to you that it is fully in order.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, to this point of order, I think that the suggestion put forward by the Honourable Leader of the House is quite a reasonable suggestion and I would hope that it would impress itself upon my honourable friend's mind. What the Leader of the House has mentioned is quite true that rules are now in the course of being changed and I can appreciate the desire of the Honourable Member from Carillon to be perhaps one of the last to get in this type of debate which has become so frequent in the last 18 months when situations were different, but, as he knows quite well, under the new rules as contemplated this type of debate would be strictly out of order. And I would suggest that in accordance with practice prior to 18 months ago it would have been out of order at that time and would have been so held by the former Speakers of the House. But insofar as the urgency of the matter is concerned, the Honourable Leader of the House made a most reasonable suggestion that this matter can be brought forward by way of resolution. There is no urgency to debate the matter today. It can be brought forward and debated by resolution, placed on the Order Paper in the regular way. And I am sure that that would meet the ends of the honourable member just as well and that he would have full opportunity to voice his sentiments regarding the subject at that time. I would humbly suggest to you, Sir, that in your wisdom you see fit to rule this motion out of order.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully suggest to you that the discussion on the point of order has been improperly before the House, because it does not become a point of order, as I understand the rules, until such time as you have received and read the requests for the adjournment of the House, and then asked whether or not the member has the leave if you think it is in order. I think the points of order that have been raised both by the members opposite and also my friend the member for Carillon are a little premature until such time as you have made the decision as to whether it is in order or not. But I would respectfully suggest that in all deference to the Leader of the House that if he reads the Report of the Committee it states in there that the change in the rules actually will apply in general after the session has been completed. (Interjection) No, I know but there was a point that my honourable friend -- but I do suggest Mr. Speaker, that if we follow the present rules that we have in the House, and I'm not speaking at this time as to what the decision of Mr. Speaker will be, but I do suggest that the discussion so far including my own is not pertinent to any order because until such time as you stated your position then it is not an order before the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I may attempt to put my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party on side I would like to say that I think the discussion at this stage is in order. I think the Leader of the House had a perfect right to raise the point of order and my honourable colleague from Carillon had the perfect right to discuss the point of order because as I see it, once you have given your decision, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer debatable, and consequently it's by grace and favour, so to speak, that you allow debate on these points of order and the time for the debate in my opinion is before you have rendered a decision. I think the Leader of the House was quite proper in raising it at that time and the member in replying to him. Apart from helping my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF party to get back in the groove, if he ever was there, I would like to say on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that I do not agree with the Honourable the Attorney-General who has suggested (a) that our present practice has been somewhat abused in the last 18 months. (Interjection). Pardon. No. no... Oh, yes, but that had nothing to do with the matter of the adjournment of the House. That's a different subject which I would be prepared to debate with my honourable friend, but it does not arise in this case. I don't think that this rule or procedure has been taken advantage of in the last 18 months any more than it was before. And then the other point -- I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that even if the new rules were in vogue now that we'd be in exactly the same position that we are now except you would then have the additional authority of deciding whether this is a matter of urgent public importance. So I really don't think that there's any point in raising

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) the fact that the rules are being changed at the moment. My honourable friend has a matter that he considers to be of urgent public importance to farmers in his own constituency and other constituencies in this province and I'm positive in my own mind Mr. Speaker, submit to you that it's quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER: In giving a decision on this matter I don't see that I can do anything else but abide by the practice of the House which has been in vogue for the last eighteen months and allow the motion. It appears to be in order in other respects. It is true that as the new rules come into effect I will have the authority to make a ruling otherwise, and I would now rule the motion in order, and it of course is subject to appeal by the House if they choose to do so.

MR. EVANS: We would accept your ruling on this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Will those members rise who support this motion? It's been moved by the Honourable Member for Carillon seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the House be now adjourned for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely: the hardships being experienced by many Manitoba farmers due to delay of the Government of Canada in meeting its commitments with regards to payment of compensation for cattle slaughtered under the brucellosis eradication program and the desirability of the Government of Manitoba petitioning the Government of Canada to take immediate action in this respect. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you for your ruling and I'm sure that after the House has listened to me for a moment they will realize that this is an important subject for many farmers in south-central Manitoba. Last Monday a farmer living south of my place stopped at my home in St. Pierre. He had with him a letter that he had received some time ago from the Canada Department of Agriculture and he showed me that letter, and I was amazed when I read the letter, and I will read the letter to the House now. "Dear Sir, we have your letter of January 21st in connection with the payment of your compensation for brucellosis reactors. Your claim has been forwarded for payment but a cheque has not been issued as funds for the payment of compensation have been temporarily depleted. Your cheque will be issued as quickly as possible after additional funds have been provided by Parliament."

Now this farmer, Sir, had had his cattle slaughtered on November 17th. Out of a herd of some 26 all the adult animals turned to be reactors. Fourteen were slaughtered. This man was left with just young cattle. His milk cows had been taken away from him and he was in distress. Immediately he proceeded to have his premises cleaned according to the regulations; he got a certificate of health from the Department of Agriculture at the end of November, and was expecting a cheque to amount to \$839 from the Federal Department. He waited and waited. On January 21st he wrote Ottawa and he received the answer that I have just read. There was no money and this man told me that he had no milk for his children; no money to buy cows, to replenish his herd; that his barn was too cold with the few number of small cattle in the barn. And I asked him, "Are there any more like you who have been told that there was no money in Ottawa to compensate?" He said, "There are many," and yesterday to the best of my ability I contacted the veterinary doctors who were testing the cattle in the municipalities of Franklin, of Montcalm, Morris and Rhineland. I spoke to two of them, one being a direct representative of the Department of Health Animals Division. And they both told me that the situation was common, that there was lots of money owing, that farmers were complaining all over the place, that they were not getting their money and that it was causing great hardship. I phoned to another gentleman that I knew very well. He told me that his cattle had been tested in September; that everything was ready for him to receive payment at the end of October; that he wrote Ottawa and received a reply the same as this one that there was no money, and then he wrote twice since that time and he has received no answer. And I'm ready to give the names of these two persons to the Minister of Agriculture if he wants to have those names.

And I say that this is not good enough. These people are enduring great hardships especially because most of the area is in the district that has suffered crop losses for two years and these farmers have no money now to replenish their herds. And I asked the question of these two veterinary doctors how much money might be owing to these farmers, and the suggestion is, well we haven't got the exact figures, between \$100,000 and \$200,000 that might be owing to these farmers. I phoned just a few minutes ago to the Winnipeg Branch of the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd) . . . Department and this statement was corroborated that there was a lot of money owing; that there was a lot of complaints; a lot of demands; a lot of phone calls and letters coming in, but that they could say nothing but wait until the Federal Government approves more money. Now I suggest that it would have been easy Mr. Speaker, for the Federal Government to pass a special warrant to provide the money to compensate these farmers as they had undertaken to do and not allow these farmers to suffer such hardships. It affects a large number of farmers in these municipalities and I would like to suggest to our Minister of Agriculture that he should take the matter immediately -- that's why I said it was urgent to bring this matter before the House. As far as these farmers who have no milk for their children, it is an urgent matter and there are quite a few in that situation. I trust that this matter will be taken into consideration by the Honourable Minister and by this House as a whole. It's not a matter as suggested that I want to be the last to bring this type of motion. I'm very serious about it; it's a very serious matter for many farmers in Manitoba.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson); Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should enter into this debate too because the parties concerned whom my colleague mentioned actually come from my constituency. I have had at least ten complaints from the different farmers of my constituency on the same grounds, and for every ten farmers probably another ten or maybe three times ten that do not come. Probably they have enough patience to listen to the plea of Ottawa that they should wait until Ottawa has some more money. I'm sure there are at least over 200 head of cattle that have been slaughtered last fall, some as far back as September and October, and these farmers have not been paid for the losses sustained under this eradication plan. There's one farmer in particular that I know that lost seven cows. He had eight milking cows, seven cows he had to slaughter, and that was in October. He has a family of five. Now he actually is forced to come to the store and purchase his milk. But that's not all. He had hoped that as soon as he got the money from Ottawa he would be able to replace his cows and he had a place where he could buy them, and at the same time he was hoping that he'd increase his herd, but not receiving this money he was forced to even buy his milk. At the same time he had made an application to the Farm Credit Corporation and he was turned down. He couldn't increase. So I think that it is really a hardship on this farmer. He had asked me to take this up in the House previously but I simply told him that this is a matter for Ottawa to discuss, but now since it was brought in I think I should draw the attention of the government, of the provincial government to this matter because really and truly it creates a hardship. This particular farmer was considering applying to the Honourable the Minister of Health for assistance -- he says "I can't make things go" -- and I wouldn't really blame him if he did. Surely the government could do something to help -- our provincial government. If the big brothers in Ottawa are broke, probably the Province of Manitoba isn't, and maybe will be good enough even to advance some money to Ottawa to pay up their bills. I thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I was unaware of this situation. It had not been brought to my attention by the farmers involved, or what is more important, by those who have, by their own words, indicated to us here that they were aware of this hardship to the farmers. And I will say this, that it wouldn't have given them near as much publicity if they had come to me, as the Minister in this province, and told me of the hardship of these farmers, but it might have been just as effective. Certainly we are very much concerned when circumstances such as these arise and our farmers are put in a difficult situation. Now there's no denying at all that a man that's lost 14 head of cattle and had to wait for months for payment is put in a difficult position, because if they were commercial cattle he would likely have received in excess of a thousand dollars in compensation. And no one can deny that when the income from these cattle have been removed and it hasn't been replaced by compensation that his circumstances are difficult indeed, and I would have every bit as much understanding I'm sure as our honourable friends in the opposition. But I think that although it was brought up as a matter of public urgency that we are just a little late. We are locking the gate or the barn door after the horses have been stolen, because I've just had word here that monies have been voted and that the compensation payments are forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: It would be customary I think Mr. Speaker, on occasions of this kind for the mover of the motion to ask leave to withdraw.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before that's done I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could tell us when this money was passed and when advice was sent to him that this was to be done.

MR. HUTTON: The information that I have, Mr. Speaker, is from the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba and when this was raised I of course contacted him immediately because I was surprised that I had not been made aware of the situation, and his information is that the monies have been voted and that the compensation is forthcoming.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if that is the case that the Honourable the Minister is telling us now, surely there will be no further delay in the matter because the indication according to the letter that my honourable colleague has is that it will have to wait until supplies have been voted by Parliament. Now ...

MR. SPEAKER: He did say that supplies had been voted, did he not?

MR. HUTTON: Further monies have been voted.

MR. CAMPBELL: I accept his word for that, Mr. Speaker. The only point is that there is quite a difference in them being provided by Parliament and being provided by special warrant. If they have been so provided by the latter method then I think that would meet the case that the Honourable Member for Carillon has been raising. If it still is a case of just having been provided through an estimate going before Parliament that they still have to be voted with no guarantee of how long that will take, then it's quite a different matter.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member first of all, what is the date of that letter? And second, if he is willing to table the letter.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I would like to state that the statement of the Minister has me surprised because at 2:20 this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I have a chance to reply before I withdraw my motion, haven't I?

MR. SPEAKER: No. There's no reply. I believe there's no reply.

MR. PREFONTAINE: At 2:20 this afternoon the head of the Branch in Winnipeg did not know ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order. The Member does not have the right to close the debate. (Interjection). . No, no, you may not close the debate.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question? I would like to know why the Minister tried to blame the members here for not telling him, when apparently his Deputy Minister knew it all the time. (Interjection) No answer eh? All right.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I asked that that letter be tabled and that the honourable member tell us the date of the letter.

MR. PREFONTAINE: The date, January 27th.

MR. EVANS: January 27th?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yes. And the man was still waiting on Monday morning.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Speaker, if I may -- would the Honourable Minister be kind enough to tell the House if he knows the answer, as to how that money has been provided? Does it appear in the estimates as suggested by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition? Or has it already been voted and ready to be paid out? And I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that according to the Honourable Member from Carillon who made this motion, he phoned the head of the department here in Winnipeg at a few minutes after two, and the one person who should have known in this province as to whether the money was there ready to be paid out, would be this gentleman, and he had no word about any money being available from Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you asking a question of the member -- the Minister?

MR. PREFONTAINE: Before we close the debate may I ask please to withdraw my motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. EVANS: On a point of order Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture finds himself in a difficult position. He waited purposely to see if

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... anyone was going to speak or make further points before he spoke for the government side. No one rose to speak and he answered the question, dealt with it as well as he could. Now we have a second series of speeches on the other side and I suggest to you that it's a rather difficult position to place the Honourable the Minister in when he can neither answer the questions nor reply to the points that have been made. If you wish to rule Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains is asking a question consequent upon the Minister's speech and you would grant the Minister the right to reply to that question, I'm sure he'd be glad to, but I think this point of order should be noted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon has asked permission of the House to withdraw the motion. Is it agreed?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable Minister a question. Would you permit him to answer that question?

MR. SPEAKER: He may or may not answer it as he chooses.

MR. HUTTON: I don't know whether the monies were made available by a vote or by special warrant. All I know is that further monies have been made available and the compensation payments should be forthcoming. That's the word that I have.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the desire of the House -- does the honourable member have the right to withdraw the motion.

SOME MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Motion withdrawn. Committee of Supply.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Leader of the House. Has the Government of Canada or any of its agencies made any proposal to the Manitoba Government relative to the development of the Turtle Head Creek project?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very glad to take this as notice of the question and provide the answer at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to draw your attention to the gallery to your left. There are 28 students from Deer Lodge Junior High School in St. James under their teacher Mr. Oldfield. I would like to welcome them on your behalf and introduce them to you Sir, and through you to the honourable members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of Supply.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VIII (a) 3. Welfare Division.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, last night my leader has very ably dealt with the Social Allowance Bill. I just want to ask one or two questions now in connection with the application for social allowance. Over 90% of this assistance are given to old age pensioners between 65 and 69 on a means test basis. Before they get it they have to complete an application answering about 48 or 50 questions under oath. A full and complete investigation is being made at that time and all that's left now to the department is to make investigation as to the need, the amount they require. And if that investigation is approved, they are going to get it under the bill. Instead of it, there is a new application being sent out the reason for which I do not know. Now these applications are being mailed to everyone that writes in to Box 1275. The majority of the old age pensioners on the means test have no way or unable to complete the application owing by the fact that so many are coming to me to help them do it. Instead of it, I thought perhaps the present office of the Old Age Assistance should -- a couple of desks should be set up for them to go there -- even this would be a hardship -- instead of writing to the box number and then wait until they are being called or they are being called upon for investigation which may or may not take a considerable time. And I think perhaps

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)...having the original application, having the annual affidavits which they have to make about their circumstances, having all the complete files, information before them, I cannot see any sense of having this application filled out again. That's number one.

Secondly, the question of religion worries me a little bit. We had this sect clause inserted in many of the employers, in universities, insurance, and every time when the question of religion is mentioned or asked for, there is a tendency -- I'm not suggesting there is anything here -- but there is a tendency when two stenographers come into one office all equally qualified -- one is called Miss Campbell and the other one is called Miss Rabinovich, and I really don't know -- without any prejudice, I think that 90% -- all equally qualified -- will probably engage Miss Campbell. I don't know any reason at all why it should be in this application.

Then of course it's quite all right when a person on old age pension, after they have made out the application, after swearing that she has no other income or has some income, as to the truth of her application, she has to go through everything else again. Cash on hand, cash in the bank, and stock on farm, and business, insurance and property and what not. If this party applies for, and they have the information, why go through it again? When you ask an old man who is existing on \$55 a month and hasn't got a cent to his name, and you ask him what bank he holds the money in; where and what and everything else -- I think, in my opinion is adding a little bit more insult. Probably this is not a good word to use, but I cannot think of another word at the moment. So I think when these applications are printed, that the Honourable Minister should take it seriously under consideration -- I mentioned it once already, and particularly to help them with their application forms to be made out. Most of them do not understand what to do and they already know where the offices are of the Old Age Pension Board, and I think the best thing would be to send them down there; or if the inspector or the investigator is to see the party, all pensioners in his home or her home, then why mail this in? They are confused, and I speak now from the experience I've had with many. They come in, they don't know anything about it and I feel that it was an error in the first place, in my opinion, and particularly the great error of the many unnecessary questions, it's only an insult to them. And thirdly in the two sections about religion -- item 13, religion and church affiliation if any -- if any -- these two words alone is questioning the person whether -- if any. I believe that everyone between 65 and 69, 99% at least have some affiliation with the church, or with a church. And 15 is absolutely understandable -- I don't understand it myself. "What needs do you have which your present income does not meet?" I think perhaps that if the honourable member who has been kind enough to work so hard on this Bill, which is a good Bill, although it is not complete, a lot of things could be improved, but however the Bill is accepted and I don't think there should be any added hardship on it. They had already waited for years for a similar bill and after the Bill was passed they had to wait a year to set up the machinery. And if it is very much further delayed I don't think they will need the additional help.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, in the speech I made on the Throne Speech I suggested to the Honourable Minister that of the 10 classifications which he had said would be covered by the provisions of the Social Allowances Act when he introduced the Bill, we had as of February the first only proclaimed two and a half of those 10 classifications. Now, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF -- and I asked them, and the Honourable Leader of the CCF asked last night for a statement from the Minister as to when the other provisions of the Act would be proclaimed. I don't intend to repeat the speech which I made on the Throne Speech except to deal with one particular item, Mr. Chairman. In introducing this Bill last year, the Minister promised that the Social Allowance Act would cover the needs of the aged, blind or disabled by way of tax allowance and/or health service. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that members of this House will realize that people in their sixties and older are the people who need health services the most. Now, we have been accused of wanting always to let the state look after things, and yet it seems to me that what we are doing in this province as of now, and I hope it will be different when the part about medical coverage will be proclaimed, but as of now we are forcing the old people who have no other means of finances to go to the out-patients' clinic of the hospitals. I am not suggesting that the standard of care which they get there is not of a

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)....high standard, but it certainly breaks down the traditional relationship which the old folks have had with their private doctors, one which I would think the Minister should be the first one to want to protect.

Now I have with me, Mr. Chairman, the annual report of the Department of Public Health for the Province of Saskatchewan for the year ending March 31st, 1959. That's a year ago, Mr. Chairman. And if you turn to page 150 of that report; and I am sure the Minister has it, if he hasn't he ought to have it -- the amount of money which they paid for the expenditure for services for long-term public assistance beneficiaries, which includes old age security and blind persons supplemental allowance cases and mother's allowance recipients including their spouses and children under 16 years of age, for that year totalled \$1,346,000. This covered medical services, dental, optical, nursing, physiotherapy, drugs, appliances etcetera. And I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very important matter and I am hoping the Minister will make an announcement that in the not too distant future this part of the Act will be proclaimed so that the people who are in need, who should be covered by the Social Allowances Act, will be covered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be too critical of the application form which is in use, or of the regulations, because I have in front of me, Mr. Chairman, a six-paged detailed analysis of that application and the regulations as compared with the regulations and the application used in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I want to tell the Minister that in 80% of the questions, that they are practically word for word what is used in Saskatchewan. I am not being critical, I think it is the system which should be used and the questions which would be used by almost any modern department and this is all to the good. What I will suggest to the House is that we are not really pioneering something which is completely new and completely different. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me the statement of policy for public assistance in the Province of Saskatchewan for the year 1957-58 which is two years old and I'll just read the first paragraph to show how similar our objectives are to theirs. And here is what they say and I quote: "The department believes that a public assistance program should be founded on a belief in the integrity and dignity of the individual and on the recognition that members of society are dependent upon one another and that the welfare of all is dependent upon the well-being of each. The purpose of the public assistance program in general terms is to provide financial assistance to persons in indigent circumstances and to do so in such a way that the recipients' capacity for self-dependence is maintained or strengthened." Well I think, Mr. Chairman, that what we are doing is much like what other provinces, Saskatchewan or Ontario are doing.

One other matter I would like to mention, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the amount of money which we are allocating for this department. As I understand it under (a) (3), and I won't speak on this again Mr. Chairman, we are providing in social allowances, \$6,050,000, and for old age assistance and blind persons allowances \$1,905,000. I have compared this with what the Province of Saskatchewan did last year, I haven't got their new estimates and they were spending in the same categories almost \$12,000,000. And I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, and very concerned that we provide sufficient money so that we will be able to get on with the job, not merely or providing for the two and a half categories which have now been proclaimed but indeed that we provide as rapidly as possible for the 10 categories which the Minister announced in introducing this Bill in the last session that would be covered by the provisions of the Bill.

Again I reiterate as I sit down, Mr. Chairman, that I for one would like a statement from the Minister as to when he would expect, and I am not suggesting that it all be done this year, but as to what timetable he has for the inclusion of these people whom he promised, not we on this side of the House at all, Mr. Chairman, the Minister himself indicated what categories and what types people would be covered by the Bill. Yesterday the Minister said that the Indian people on reserves could only be handled after the most -- and I am just speaking from memory, we haven't got the Hansard yet -- that the Indian people on reserves who would eventually qualify for assistance under this Social Allowances Act, could only be handled after the most careful study had been made of their problems in consultation with the Federal Government. And I agree with this statement, as a matter of fact I think I suggested precisely this would happen when the Bill was introduced last year. I would like to know how many other groups in the same

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)....categories which the Minister listed last year are in the same spot. How many more categories that the Minister said last year would be covered by this Act are going to take one, two or three or more years before they will be covered. In brief, Mr. Chairman, these are the points that I would like to raise.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister has been asked this question or not, if he has he will forgive me. Would he give us a breakdown of (a) (3) of the 6,000,000 when he has given answers to the other questions?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it is possible that this application and this questionnaire might be pretty lengthy but in all fairness I think it is one thing to fight discrimination and another thing to yell "discrimination" without just cause. I think that the Minister -- in all fairness to the Minister, he gave us the explanation why this question was there about the religion or church affiliation and I think it's very good. He mentioned that in case any of these people are to be admitted to an old folks home or one of those institutions, they would want to try to do the right thing. This question might prevent a person of Jewish faith ending up in a Protestant institution or a Protestant in a Catholic one and so on, and I think it's very good, and it is unfair to insinuate or even mention the word "discrimination". And number 15 also, "What needs do you have which your present income does not meet," there is in all possibility that some older people might stay with their children, that they are ready to provide shelter, they can't afford that, but that is provided. The government shouldn't have to do that. And there is another point that the Honourable the Member from St. John mentioned, this question of insisting or asking these patients to go to the out-door department of the different hospitals. Well there is another point to look at in this respect, if that isn't done, especially this business of staying with your own doctor, I don't know if that is so important now in this age of specialists, you're always sent to another one every week or every month, and I think these out-patient departments are giving excellent medical care and if that isn't done, the different teaching hospitals would have to close those out-patient departments and I think they would lose a lot of their good doctors and their teachers and I think that the medical profession would be the poorer for it.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a little different tack here in regard to social allowances, insomuch as I am a little concerned about the lack of liaison between the government and our municipalities. Now having been a partner to this Act when it was passed last year -- and we thought it was a step in the right direction -- now I feel that it is our duty to go ahead and see that this is implemented as soon as possible, just as we did with the Education Bill. I have been in touch with one of our municipalities and they are quite concerned because they did not have a copy of the allowances until I delivered it to them two days ago. Whether that's their fault or a little mistake, I do not know, but this lack of liaison is concerning me because applicants have to apply to Box Number so and so, Winnipeg. I feel that inasmuch as the municipalities have been taking care of these people and will still continue to take care of them until they are liable to be on social welfare for more than 90 days, it seems logical to me that better communications could have been maintained with the municipalities, because I think it is frightening to a lot of people to be coldly told that they have to apply to a box number. Now I realize that there has been a lot of work done here, a lot of good work, but I would make an appeal that better liaison take place with the municipalities. For instance, why could the municipalities not handle these applications, because they know the people, they have known them for years. It seems to me as we are making it hard to get this scheme into effect. As far as the form is concerned, I don't think that is the most important thing at all. I think that the municipalities would be quite willing to co-operate. I don't think we are making the best use of them. I think we all feel it is a step in the right direction and we'll probably have some constructive criticism to offer along the way, but now that we have this scheme, let's all get together and try to make it work. And I think one of the best ways is to take the municipalities into our confidence and get their co-operation and not sort of divorce ourselves from them in the implementation of this Act.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Honourable the Minister the other day correctly, when he said that all persons who had previously made application for total disability pensions, and had their application turned down for a number of reasons, did he say that they could now make application for Social Allowances? I have always felt, Mr.

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.).....Chairman, that here was a class of people, I don't know how many hundreds are involved, but here are a class of people that really need some help. Are the people who have made application for total disability pension and had their application rejected for a number of reasons, there are several in my own constituency and they are in real dire need, most of them. Now I am not absolutely clear on that one. I supplied an application form to one of those individuals the other day and the social workers called and led him to believe that he would not qualify. On checking the application, I see that, right at the top, that it says this form is for use of only those persons who by reason of infirmity are unable to care for themselves or who have reached the age of 65 years. Now it is possible that if the Social Allowances Act is broadened to include this group, that it will reduce the number of applications coming in for total disability pensions.

And another question under item (3) (a) (3) the 6 million odd. Is it expected that this amount will be entirely used up or required for the three categories that were mentioned in the Information Service Bulletin that went out from the office on January 29th? That's another question. And is it anticipated that the municipalities will have less to pay in 1960 than they did in '59 for social assistance? The reason I ask that, Mr. Chairman, is that under 3 (a) (6) the estimates are up this year to what they were last year.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this welfare and social allowance scheme. Last year the Minister outlined a very elaborate program, and it took a whole year to implement and the forms printed. And this year I understand the increase is going to be nearly \$2,000,000. I would like to cite a few cases about which I have been in touch with our welfare department, and which for different reasons were turned down during the last year for additional assistance and welfare. And I will try and compare them with the plan which is calculated now and I figure is calculated on the basic needs of the individual rather than on necessities.

Now this first case, Mr. Chairman, is the case of an old age pension couple with an income of \$110 per month. They own their own property and the wife requires very heavy drug treatments every month which is quite a strain on his purse strings. But after investigation, the inspector found out that they had a bank account and they were turned down. And this gentleman, at that time he didn't even know he had a bank account -- it's just unfortunate these people found out. The bank account amounted to \$10.80 and he was turned down and right now they have to exist on two meals a day to make ends meet.

Another case, Mr. Chairman, is the case the husband is a pensioner but the wife is not eligible, an income of \$55.00 per month. But they own their own property, and they own some swamp land from which they have no income, and assistance was turned down.

Another case, a crippled girl living with her widowed mother, not on pension, but they own their own property, no assistance because the daughter has to maintain household.

Apparently, Mr. Chairman, the people that own their property are being discriminated against. I don't know what they're supposed to do when they own their own property whether they are supposed to start eating the doors or windows or what, but that seems to be the bug-bear in that experience. If you own your property they want to turn these cases down.

And this last one Mr. Chairman, is the case of a widow who has a son residing with her making a very modest income, barely enough to meet household expenses, and she can't get any assistance as they claim she owns her own home and son working. So now she is going to break up her home, sell her property, live off the proceeds, then of course, she'll have no home, no financial resources and she will receive assistance.

So, Mr. Chairman, I could give you many more examples and I look at the new set-up, I doubt that many of them will receive assistance because under this clause here -- well, on February 1st the Social Allowance, the new provincial program will cost 4.6 million in the current year, more when it hits its stride. Well I don't know when it's going to hit its stride. Old age pension, help for the old people above the normal, beyond the regular federal pension will cost 3.3 million. Well, I doubt that, Mr. Chairman, because when I cite these cases, when these people applied they were turned down. And when you look at what is cited as basic need, it says in determining whether an applicant is eligible to receive Social Allowance, the director shall take into account according to the circumstances and need of the applicant. But total cost of the basic necessities of the applicant and his dependents, from which he shall deduct the

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....financial resources of the applicant and his dependents and if the cost of the basic necessities is in excess of the financial resources he may pay no allowance." So Mr. Chairman, I figured that the people with the lowest income are the old age pensioners and according to the basic need of an old age pensioner, a single person, the basic need as according to this list, food \$23 a month, rent \$20 a month, clothing, \$5 a month, personal needs \$5 a month, which comes to a total of \$53 per month, they receive \$55 so their income exceeds their basic needs so they don't qualify. The only person that I know could actually exist on this, and I know of a case and some of my constituents know, we have an old age pensioner that pays no rent, no fuel, no utilities and he gets by very nicely on \$55 a month because he squats on the nuisance grounds.

Now under that same program, Mr. Chairman, old age pensioner, a couple, taken off the same list of basic needs, two adults, food \$43 per month, clothing \$10 per month, shelter \$20, personal needs \$10 per month that comes to a total of \$996. per year, fuel for 9 months, they take it on a 9 months basis, \$152 per year, they allow then another \$150 which is for special needs. It comes to a total of \$1,298 per year and their pension is \$1,320., so they wouldn't qualify for assistance because the cost of the basic necessities is not in excess of their financial resources. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how this is based on but I think the Minister when he was making out this schedule -- I've got a little speech that James Coyne, Governor of the Bank of Canada made to the Canadian Club in Winnipeg January 18th and the heading is "Living Within Our Means." And I think the Minister must have had this in mind. And then he goes on, I am not going to read all of it, "spending must be held down and the need for self-restraint". Now Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this leaflet doesn't apply to my people here and I am quite sure when the Minister and his staff when making out this basic needs of an individual or family, they certainly were down to the barest minimum.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to start off by answering my honourable friend that has just spoken. I want him to know that when I spoke last year on this subject, I meant it and I felt it. And I say to him again, this is, I think, the best social legislation any province has produced and it's a darn good Act. The references which he makes are simply that I have gone to great lengths in the past, and I don't intend to go through the rehearsal again today, but I want him to know that in determining these regulations we acted on the best advice we could get from the people who are experienced for many years in this department. We spelled out the various items and food for instance, according to Canada's food rules of April, 1958; secondly, clothing, shelter, various items including \$150 for special needs including a personal and household needs of \$10. It's right in the Act and we say when we add them up, if their needs are more than what their income is we'll make up the difference. He wants me to return to Saskatchewan, does he, and the \$5.00 across the board plus medical care?

We're going to do the job here and I'll get on with explaining the other questions. But I want no mistake made, Mr. Chairman, that this is a good Act, that there is no hokus pokus or ulterior motive in writing these regulations or spelling out this Act. It's laid down, it's in black and white and those regulations are in black and white and they can be improved on from time to time, certainly. But certainly I know if I go out to a first class cafe I pay \$3.00 for a good dinner. This Act is meant to meet the needs of the people and as Minister of this department I have to take their assets into consideration. Certainly, my honourable friend by converse wouldn't want me giving a corporation lawyer \$100 a month as soon as he disposed of his \$2,000,000 and declared himself in need. No Sir. I can't see these arguments. We've tried to send out a person to sit down with the pensioner with this application form -- we have to have some means of identification, some records, some reason. We have regionally trained supervisors who check these in the initial instance to get uniformity across the province. There's nothing too offensive about this. We didn't go to Saskatchewan to copy it, it was written by our own senior staff in this Department. Now in Saskatchewan of course if you have over \$850 a year you get an automatic \$5 across the board -- does it meet need? I submit in many cases it doesn't meet need. We have the provisions and I'll come to them in due course but I took the trouble of going over a hundred cases out of our files over there to come to an average figure in these regulations. I've got four pages here I'd be glad to go over with my honourable friend -- the allowances given under this Act in Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. What is it that happened here? Let's just take an example. What is this one -- this is a mother

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.). . . . with -- take one for here -- example of a mother, father, three children, two, five and nine, basic necessities, Manitoba proposal \$145.; Ontario \$140.63 plus milk and vitamins; Saskatchewan a flat rate of \$100; BC a flat rate of \$140. Oh yes, and I can go on but I won't bother my honourable friends. Mother and one child aged ten; Manitoba \$109; Ontario \$109 plus milk; Saskatchewan a flat rate of \$60; Alberta \$60; BC \$60. We went through all these. I'm convinced and as a responsible person in charge of this department, I want to inform this committee, Mr. Chairman, that these have been a very fair schedule, certainly it's got to be realistic; we are trying to meet need within the resources of this province in a fair and equitable manner and it's the duty of the honourable member opposite that has difficult cases in this category to bring them to my attention. I'll be only too glad to go over them with him.

Now to answer some of these questions that have accumulated and by golly they've accumulated. I want to talk first of all about -- seven months ago of course, we sat here and everybody stood up and voted in favour of this Bill 100%. It's a good Act. You gentlemen did the right thing that day. Now, we tried very clearly to make the intent of the Act clear. I'd like to give -- the Honourable Member from Neepawa brought up a very good point and one that I indicated yesterday in my remarks as concerned me a great deal since becoming Minister, as I saw this out in rural Manitoba just what he's talking about. And in this first proclamation of this Act and I went into the reasons why we had to stage this. When the patient's diagnosis is made the sick patient is finally diagnosed and hope is in the offing, orderly treatment is the way to go about it and you do it in stages. You don't go through them from stem to gudgeon in one big crack, you take your time, and you do a job, and look out for contamination. But what I'm saying is that he gave a very good question. All those who require someone else to look after them, is exactly what I said yesterday -- those people who applied for DA but didn't come under the stringent regulations which I'm not going into again now but which I put forward in no uncertain terms at the Federal level, these people who require someone to look after them are going to come under the Act as it's proclaimed on the first and we do have a diary of quite a few of those who require this type of care. That is they are disabled and we think, and it is necessary to have someone else look after them and we think quite justifiably this is one group we wanted to take in as soon as we could. In other words the first proclamation was meant to relieve the municipalities of the aged and infirm problem, the child welfare, and thirdly the cash allowance to the pensioners, and fourthly this group. Really the three categories, plus this that we wanted to take in in the first step and as we go along and as we absorb this first impact on our staff and our resources and our ability to cope with the whole problem, we will proclaim the others just as soon -- and I'm not going to tell the committee just exactly when that will be, but you can have my assurance that it will be certainly as soon as we can get on with the job. And we have a good staff; it's second to none and they'll get on with it and we'll have this thing in good shape before too long. But the staff felt that we couldn't handle that large category of people who were turned down from DA and who had an infirmity, but did not require someone to look after them unless because of age they had this -- or mental or physical incapacity that is not so severe that they require someone to look after them. Certainly it's the second part of the proclamation would call for the assessment of these people as to the Social Allowance application. I can tell the honourable member that we have quite a few cases of people -- a woman who was thin with flat feet who wanted a disability pension and quite true that she may very easily qualify for a pension on medical assessment, but this other group is so important at this time, Mr. Chairman, that we are putting our resources into that area to begin with.

Now when we come to -- I'd like to deal with a few of the questions first that were duplications. Why religion? As the Honourable Member from St. Boniface pointed out and quite rightly. In putting this into the application form there was certainly no ulterior motive, other than to assist in placement. It's not an issue with the department and the instructions to the staff are that if the patient or applicant does not want to state their religion we're not going to force them to do so; this is merely for our own information if the patient so wishes to tell us and as the Honourable Member from St. Boniface pointed out, very often there is this preference in the placement of aged and infirm in institutions that they go to a home which has the religious background to which they're accustomed and I can speak from personal experience having been

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.).... a physician to a Lutheran Home for 13 years that it's most important that these people found that the religious atmosphere of the home was a very big factor in their great age and we just want to respect these wishes should they arise. What relatives to be noted? I think it's easy to answer this question because if we have patients in homes -- in long term facilities, and the patient passes on, we like to know who the relatives are. Don't forget this application covers -- people in these certain facilities are going to be making this application, or after being on this allowance they may go into these institutions and certainly we don't want to ask old people who are hanging onto life, to approach them at that stage and say, "Who is your closest relative?" The Section 15, "What are his needs?" Certainly, as the Honourable Members pointed out this social worker can very easily place these needs at the end of the application form; what he recognizes or feels are the real needs of the patient, but this was designed particularly to allow the patient to express to the worker and put it down in the application form in his own words which can be written in here, "What does that patient feel is their greatest single need?" The Honourable Member from Kildonan mentioned one applicant had sufficient resources at \$55 a month to get along in a small home but had an astronomical drug bill. This is what we want to know in this application form and there's certainly no other motive there other than that we're trying to attempt to find a fair minded way of dealing with the applicant and to get his side of the story. That's all that that little clause is for.

Now, when we come to the regulations and the Leader of the CCF mentioned the \$1,000 exemption which is now connected with the granting of an Old Age Assistance, that is the applicant can have up to \$1,000; why do we only give them \$200? And he contrasted this, as I say, with the means test. Now this I think is another illustration between the needs and the means test. We are saying under the Social Allowance Act and Regulations that we will meet need. By the same token we can't say that a person with \$1,000 in the bank is in need. We make provision not for \$55 across the board but the cost of food, clothing, rent, personal necessities, utilities, health care. We undertake the funeral upon the patient's death if necessary. When old age assistance plan came into effect there was no social allowance based on need; they had to determine what the dividing line was to get a \$55 pension. We simply say in this Act that we don't think a person with a \$1,000 in the bank is in real need and the Old Age Assistance Act is not interested in whether a pensioner is in need or not they just want to know that he has a real or calculated income of \$960 single and \$1,620 married and in this calculation they allow \$1,000 worth of liquid assets or cash. I think the whole idea of social allowances would be defeated when we make full provision for the basic necessities for people and then allow them to retain substantial cash or liquid assets. For instance I'd like to -- I wrote out a little example this morning when I was thinking of this -- an applicant 67, on old age assistance, with \$1,000 in the bank living in his own home, taxes and repairs and so on come to \$100 a year. Well this could be calculated as his rent as he has his own shelter therefore his food would be \$23.; his rent \$8.50; clothing \$5.; utilities \$4.; fuel \$6., this is the actual cost say; personal needs \$10 for \$56.50. In other words he only -- it's unreasonable to pay this man extra allowance or to provide him with health needs and so on in addition to this, when he's got \$1,000 in the bank. Now are we going to leave that \$1,000 for him to bequeath to his relatives; on the other hand we give assurance in the Act, that when he hasn't got the money or he has only \$200 and does need help we can see that he gets it. This is the basic difference between those who want to give assistance across the board in my opinion, based solely on age as contrasted with our position that we will guarantee an old age pensioner who is in need. We say the needs program is a basic responsibility of government and it's one we're able to afford.

Now the Honourable Leader of the CCF mentioned the Act and Regulations as no advance. He's not satisfied that the needs test is any different from the means test with special reference to the fact that municipalities were able to grant extra cash assistance for an 80% reimbursement, and I'm only simply saying that I'm satisfied that this is the right way to meet the needs of these people and that this is a substantial difference between the approach and the approach of the municipalities under the means test. We just have to admit, Mr. Chairman, that there is this basic disagreement in this basic difference in philosophy which I emphasized at the last session and thought that that had finally been cleared away.

Now as regards the item that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and has been brought up today by the Honourable Member from Ethelbert in asking about this appropriation

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) in the estimate book of 3 (a) — of the 6 million dollars. Now the estimates when they were brought in last year the honourable members will recall it was 4.684 million and I said we'd bring the Act in as soon as possible and I tried to refuse to be tied to a definite date and did say if possible by the end of October and this money was based on the proclamation that this Act would be proclaimed for five months of this year. Now as we see it it will only be proclaimed for two months. Now we know we will have it in effect for a full year in the coming year and we added, we put the vote up approximately 1.4 million, 1.366, and this estimate includes the additional cost for social allowances program for the full year's period that is. Now in a breakdown of this I think I could best explain it in this way that how did we spend the 4.6 million. Now the Mother's Allowance type of a case there is an expenditure of 2.1 million. These are the provincial responsibilities; provincially aged and infirm, \$206,000; relief and unorganized roughly \$500,000. and provincial cases in municipalities or transients where the province has 100% responsibility \$500,000. which means the 3 million, 370 thousand. Now for the two months that we have proclaimed the Act in this year and before our caseload mounts we made an anticipated expenditure of \$355,000 and when you subtract this from 4 million six you get approximately \$950,000. which is available for transfer for municipal expenses. You see whereas last year we, the honourable members will recall we voted \$900 and some odd thousand as municipal reimbursement but as our organization and methods went into the reorganization of our welfare staff and as we were advised to stage our program in sections to avoid a chaotic bulge in our facilities and abilities to handle the whole program in one fell swoop, therefore it meant that the municipalities carried on with these categories of assistance such as the mother's allowance type case which they still have to administer on the 80% reimbursement. So the money we have not used in straight reimbursement to the municipality, this money can be added back to pay the municipal reimbursements. For instance we voted last year to take over the entire welfare or the maintenance of children and we will not spend all of that. It normally costs about \$330,000 to the province or would have cost this year and in two months of the proclamation at 100% adds another \$150,000 giving \$487,000 which taken from the vote of \$928 of last year leaves us \$441,000. So we added the monies left under the 4.6 million minus the 3.7 million which was \$900,050 plus the \$441,000 under the Child Welfare which gave us 1.4 million which is the amount of money which we would require to reimburse the municipalities for their caseload. It's worked out just at that figure. In other words the increase from this year -- when I said 4 million six last fall I anticipated carrying this load for five months but it turned out we're carrying it a little longer -- for a little shorter period -- we're adding another 1.4 million to that amount to cover us for a 12 month period. This 6 million, of course, as you see in the estimates here does not include the reimbursement to the municipalities which is 1.49 million. This is just what we anticipate in the coming year with the increasing -- due to the fact that we're not able to proclaim that Mother's Allowance section at this time. The members will see that the Board and Maintenance is in here in its entirety and the social allowance of 6 million is largely made up there to cover the aged and infirm in institutions with the provision of cash allowance to our old age pensioners. What reimbursements from Ottawa do we receive in our expenditures? I think that's clear that because we are giving extra cash allowance on the basis of need we are able to claim 100% reimbursement from Ottawa except for administration, health care and drug costs and child welfare. These exclusions are out of our Act but that means pretty well that in all but drugs and health care in this 6 million, we are eligible for reimbursement from Ottawa. If we give this on a means test basis, tied to income ceilings we would not get reimbursements from Ottawa. That's why we are doing this Act the way we are. Now the Honourable Member from Inkster was objecting and it has been expressed by others the method of application. Well we advertised, as you know, for a week or ten days in the daily press asking the people to apply directly to our Welfare Office in their region or to 232 Memorial Blvd. or for convenience to a Box number. Now the objective there was that those people who felt the need of an extra allowance could have someone drop a note if they couldn't do it themselves into that Box number and we would diarise it and we did this in order that our workers could go out in an organized manner and take so many applications in an area at one time and also we realized that -- there would be misunderstanding in some quarters and whenever they wrote into us direct we diarised it. We sent in some cases, we sent applications out; we told them these were available at the Health Offices

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) or at the Municipal offices throughout the province so that if they felt they would like to go to the municipal offices and get a form and fill it out and send it in, fine, but our whole objective was to get the people applying through central points, and I don't understand why the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks has had so much trouble with his municipal office. I've had no trouble with some of my country points which I represent. The secretary-treasurers are aware and have been notified of the aged and infirm, child welfare is now a provincial cost as of the 1st of February. They've been told we're giving cash allowance; they've sent application forms to give people who apply to them directly. We have pointed out as I say in the papers where they can apply; to their regional offices and seven regions in the province. The reason for doing this was -- nothing is perfect, possibly there were more streamlined methods we could have used in getting this off the deck but the objective was to get people applying to a central point for their locality in that we could send out teams of workers and take a group of applications at one time. My instructions to the staff were to sit down with older people and take a friendly application from them and try and determine their real needs at that time. I resent and I reject the fact that our liaison has been in any way cold blooded and my instructions are exactly the opposite and I know my Deputy Minister has given similar instructions to all his staff who are acting in that way.

Now the Honourable Member for St. John's, I don't intend to repeat all I've said earlier. He has the ten points and those ten points will be acted on as I say in an orderly fashion and within the resources of this Department and to the best of our ability and as quickly as possible. I would like to say a word about our point here that -- I would like to say first of all before I mention the health provisions, in that our out-patient clinics I think, and I say this in all sincerity, the University clinics or the focal points of medical diagnosis and treatment in this province are by necessity from herein probably going to become more and more centralized in the sense that for these high cost procedures and high cost investigations the fact that the hospital plan-- the taxpayers are now paying for this very expensive equipment and so on -- that these facilities will have to be utilized to a great extent both by the general public and by the people receiving social allowance.

Now I can inform the committee, Mr. Chairman, that at this point concerning medical care we are in the midst of negotiations with various professional groups to provide easy and ready access to medical care for these people. Now the sensible and obvious way in which to do this is to make an arrangement whereby the person in receipt of a social allowance will carry a card which will entitle him to go to a doctor or dentist for this care. And such a scheme requires the full co-operation and understanding of these professional bodies. It is my best judgment at this time that these agreements will be ready very shortly and in the meantime until the cards are issued I have instructed my staff that no case goes without the essential health services and that they're to individualize until such agreements are concluded, and these negotiations are proceeding and I would inform this committee that I think that we will have very satisfactory arrangements and I cannot speak too highly of the tremendous co-operation which I as Minister, and my senior officials have received in discussing these problems with these various professional groups.

Now I want to say as I say though however, I want it to be perfectly clear that I believe firmly in the fact that -- and I think as we go forward in the field of hospitalization and medical care in the Province of Manitoba wherever it is, the tremendous cost of the newer diagnostic facilities and all this sort of thing demands more centralization in this area but I also on the other hand believe very strongly that people that are old and ill require the right to call a doctor when they are sick and this is the philosophy of the Manitoba Medical and the Canadian Medical Association of this Dominion and we are going to go in the fullest co-operation to retain what we think is good and go a long way towards furthering medical care of these senior citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

Now I would also like to inform the committee or mention in answer to the Honourable Member from Rhineland -- he spoke of the policy concerning the people of native ancestry and I would refer him to my introductory statement at the opening of the Health estimates and to my remarks made in the Welfare Division concerning our plans in that area because I hear so much repetition, Mr. Chairman, as a quiet member of this House that I can't bear to hear myself say this again for the third time.

(Mr. Johnson, Gimli, cont'd.) The Old Age Assistance duplication the Honourable Member from Inkster will answer automatic enrolment business. Well let's put it this way. By describing assets doesn't necessarily mean you disqualify a person, but how do you determine need if you don't ask questions? I think that -- I want to make it plain that as Minister in charge of administering this program I both have to try and bring the benefits to these pensioners and at the same time protect public funds. I think the honourable members of this committee would be the first to jump on me or my staff or this government for giving extra assistance where it isn't needed but I say that the time has come and this will be the future pattern of social security for the Dominion of Canada and I predict this, that nobody can improve on this Act and don't let any neighbouring province tell you that they can improve on the Social Allowances Act that, the Act itself to meet the basic necessities. You can't go beyond that without hitting at total welfare state and I don't intend to go there as long as I'm in this office. But I'll say this, I do believe these people have need; I am concerned that they are met in a fair and equitable manner, taking into consideration what they have. Certainly they're spelled out, they can be followed, there should be no possible objection to a fair minded approach like this. And as I say Old Age Assistance and these various means test things are going to go out with hoop skirts in the course of time because the Old Age Assistance and so on of today with the present means test does not disqualify a person from having a social allowance. Let that be clear. Thank you.

.....continued on next page.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, just one word. Firstly, no one has charged the Minister of being cold-blooded; and if we have criticized very mildly certain aspects of the legislation, if we wouldn't have done it we wouldn't have received such an enlightening explanation. Now we are a little bit wiser and we'll do it again.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Honourable Minister interpreted my remarks as meaning that I thought that liaison between the municipalities was cold-blooded. I did not use that term. In fact I tried to get over the point that we have one of the finest social welfare departments in Manitoba and they have been looking after our people, especially our old people for many years. What I tried to make, Mr. Chairman, is the point that these warm-blooded people who are administering this department in West Kildonan would like to assist, because I said at the beginning we were all partners in putting through this Act. Now I think that when you want change, Mr. Chairman, it's a law in psychology that you take as many people into your confidence as you can and you sell them the idea, then it's very easy to get people to accept change. But I say again that I think the approach was wrong, that by divorcing themselves from the municipal officials and trying to put this over that they have lost themselves a staunch ally and I would just simply suggest again that they co-operate and they'll find that they'll have wonderful support.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I overheard the Minister say that the province paid 100% of the welfare costs of transients. I would like to ask the Minister just what the departmental definition of a transient is because the way it is now, we have recipients of welfare who are in effect transients. That is, they lived in a municipality at one time and consequently that municipality is responsible for the payment of welfare monies, but that family has since then moved to one, two, even ten, fifteen municipalities and are in fact transients in the proper sense of the word, and yet obviously they are not being considered as transients and the municipalities in which they once lived are held responsible. I would like some comment on that.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the transient--the expenditure here I might inform my honourable friend comes largely from the granting of assistance to the single transients through the City of Winnipeg. We took over the costs of administering this assistance to these transients in this area. As I understand it a transient is a person who has not gained municipal residence and is a direct provincial responsibility. The term resident of a municipality, I think we both are clear on that, that that is a person who has lived in a municipality for a year, and moves from say my town to your town, and you continue to bill back to the town of Gimli. But if these people come from unorganized territory or have no municipal abode they become a provincial responsibility. Now under the new Social Allowance Act we, the province, act as a municipality to that group; and when we get the entire Act proclaimed of course the municipalities will be left with the unemployable healthy adult in the municipality, the desertion under a year and the jail up to a year. These are the categories that we have yet to take over. For my honourable friend's information this business of establishing legal residence, legal municipal residence I think has bug-beared provincial governments and municipalities for years. And--beg your pardon?

MR. ORLIKOW: Why not wipe it out.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Wipe it out?

MR. ORLIKOW: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): We pretty well have my friend.

MR. ORLIKOW: Fine.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should be discussing this under (a) 3--I don't know. I'm on social allowances yet but we have been discussing that. In regard to the regulations under the Social Allowances Act (g) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, under the regulations, it is quite conceivable that a lot of the people presently in receipt of pension will require assistance only for that section of the Act. It is quite conceivable. Now did I understand the Honourable the Minister to say that in order to receive the benefits under that section that you would necessarily have to have a social allowances card to present to obtain the benefits of that because it would seem to me that there are plenty of people in the province today who would not necessarily have to make application today because they may not need those benefits immediately. I would like to clear up that point.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Neepawa has raised a very good point and I think I can explain that quite readily. The hope is that when our arrangements are completed for care, medical and dental care, that the patient will receive an identifying card for that service. Now at the same time we--I would say this that it's quite true that many people don't need cash allowances, but they'll be right on the line on cash allowance and with their--they own their own home and so on, and they might qualify--but they have no other resources; they meet the Social Allowances Act in every respect except that they haven't got a nickel for drugs, and they have severe arthritis and so on.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): In that case the instructions to the staff are on the basis of the need you can grant the card--if that is the need that's what we'll meet. You don't necessarily have to be receiving cash allowance at that stage.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, the officer is instructed to issue the card then is he on examination? Or is that not so? Well, certain items under (g) I would say No. 2 and 3 and 7 perhaps, they are presently available through the municipal, through the municipality are they not? And the municipality can recover 100% on probably 50% of those items.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): On a fee for service basis. You say municipalities are paying those bills now?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I think a pensioner can make application for certain items and the municipality can recover 100%. Is that not so at the moment?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I think you're a little mistaken there--I think any supplementary allowance or extra assistance of this nature including health care which the municipalities sent in on form special, they got 80% reimbursement on it; what glasses they did give the people in their own community and so on. I think the honourable member would agree as I made in my earlier statement, the object is to give to the recipient of social allowance, if he's enrolled and entitled, if the need is there and our worker determines that need, and in borderline cases where the circumstances warrant, he can send that in to the regional supervisor who will okay a social allowance with respect to health care to the categories we of course have been talking about. This would mean the issuance of a card identifying that person both to the physician and to the dentist. These arrangements as I say we are making--negotiations are continuing at this present time and in the meantime I have asked the workers in dealing with these cases where there is an essential and the need arises--the patient has qualified for extra cash allowance--there is a situation existing that requires this aid--until these agreements are formalized and in operation, I have instructed them to meet this need. Now we have, I might say, had literally dozens of meetings with these various groups and hope to have things under way shortly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the CCF.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two. I want to thank the Minister of Welfare because that is the section of his department we're dealing with now for answering the questions that were directed towards him. We may not have been satisfied with the answers and I'm sure my honourable friend will appreciate that coming from me, but we do thank him for the general manner in which he attempted to answer.

I would take it, and I might frankly confess I got lost when the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare was attempting to answer the question as to the allocation of the \$6,050,000. He refers--(interjection)--you got lost too. Well then fine--we both are in the woods.--(interjection)--yes, I was just going to say that. I was just going to say that, Mr. Chairman. We will have to refer to Hansard of today in order to establish the relationship of all the figures--but I would like to ask him though, because of the fact that he was dealing with the four million six of last year estimate, would it be proper for us in general to apply a percentage figure or a relationship of those amounts into the \$6,050,000 of this year in order that we may establish some comparison between last year's \$6,400,000 or last year's \$4,600,000, and this year's \$6 million odd, so that we will have a general breakdown--and I appreciate the fact that the Minister might not have a full breakdown of the actual \$6,050,000 today.

One other thing that I cannot help but say is that there is a dispute between the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare and myself as to the definition of what is being attempted in this new social allowance despite all the defense of my honourable friend. There is in many cases, in my opinion, a very narrow definition between the word "need" and the word

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . "means", but I think that whether there is or not a difference of opinion between the two of us, the basic principle involved is to get aid to people who require it, and with that I will agree with him. I think it would only be fair for me to say to him, however, that I don't agree with him in his very broad and general statement when he says that in the social allowance program of the Province of Manitoba that we have the model and the foundation for all of the Acts in the Dominion of Canada, because I am sure--and I am sure that he agrees at heart with me--that there is room for much improvement. I don't think, however, that the Honourable Minister would go as far as agreeing with me that until such time as we have enacted on the statute books of every province across the dominion a truly social allowance comprehensive security measure, that we will have reached an ideal for all of the--that was a pretty tough one. I couldn't even repeat it myself, honourable Sir.

A MEMBER: We can read it in Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: We'll read it in Hansard, and maybe after reading it in Hansard, Mr. Chairman, I'll want to amend it myself. But I think that as we have attempted to get this House to adopt, and our colleagues in Ottawa have attempted to have enacted in that jurisdiction, until such time as we have a truly comprehensive health insurance plan and program, possibly contributory, across all of the provinces in Canada, we'll still have differences of opinion with the very energetic and enthusiastic Minister of Health and Welfare of this province and other provinces. So I say, again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and admire the manner in which the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare set out to answer these questions. He has not as yet convinced me--and maybe it's because I am a stubborn sort of an individual in many respects--he still hasn't convinced me that there is much basic difference in this Act as between need and means. And now I see my honourable friend is just chaffing at the bit. Let's go.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I just want to close this debate I'm sure and then we'll pass all the items, but I just want to say three things; the philosophy behind this, and I am largely responsible for this with my staff and this government, and I feel very responsible towards the people of Manitoba, when you hear all these frightening things these days as to where we're going in the field of welfare. But I make three observations to my honourable friend, and I want him to remember them because I think we'll change his philosophy yet, Sir. It is this: If there is a \$100 worth of need it has to be met; you don't believe in meeting unnecessary needs. Therefore the challenge is to the administration to meet this need in as fair and equitable a manner as we see fit. The means test looks at income; the means test does not say "what are your needs", Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: That's where the basic difference between the two of us is.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You believe that the means test does bring out need.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You are a champion of the means test, Sir?

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, no, Mr. Chairman, if I may say that I am not the champion of the means test at all, but what I am simply saying is this--and I think in this the Minister is wrong--the Minister has told us in this House that whereas under the Social Assistance Act the financial resources of the people were taken into consideration, and if the income of a single person was \$960 and they did not qualify, and that on a basis of how close they came to that \$960 so their pension or the percentage of the \$55 per month was based. Now I would say this, that if that ended right then and there in the past, then it would have been a means test and a means test alone; but it didn't end there because of the fact that if that person was not able to meet his needs in many of the respects that this Bill proposes that they do, they had the alternative of going to the municipalities and obtaining it. Now then, I used to argue with my honourable friends to my right of the Liberal Party on that basis.

MR. CAMPBELL: You sold this man on this program and now he won't stand up to it.

MR. PAULLEY: And I think that I was right by saying that it was not the municipal responsibility but the government's responsibility, it having more access to a broader level of tax collection, or a broader field. Now then, the difference between the Minister and myself on the interpretation, Mr. Chairman, is simply that that whereas before after the province in its consideration to social assistance had arrived at a percentage figure based on income in relation to the \$55 and then they left them alone to appeal to the municipalities for additional aid. The present administration has gone a lot further, and I say without any hesitancy at all,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . because they have said in effect this; we're not going to worry too much on the qualifications in respect to social aid, but we're not going to ask the municipalities; we're going to do it ourselves; and that's what I tried to convince my honourable friends without success that they should do.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now you're getting back to that system.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm not getting back to it at all--now look, this is an awful predicament for an innocent young man like me to be in, Mr. Chairman. But what I'm saying is this, that in effect, in effect what the government is doing now is assuming the responsibility--not the responsibility--assuming the role that was formerly that of the local municipality--with one big difference--and in this I'll give the government full credit for. Whereas before, depending in what municipality the individual lived in, his needs on the basis of "means" was treated in different ways, the government approach is now--and I think reasonably favourable to the person--to acknowledge a more universal or province-wide approach. But I still maintain--I still maintain that basically there isn't too much difference because of the fact--the big difference I say is that whereas before the municipal government entered into the picture insofar as the needs of the individual were concerned at the municipal level, for which they did receive back certain percentages as we well know of the 40%, 80%. That is the field that the provincial government has entered into, and I suggest that that is the difference between the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare and myself again. I recognize that the Government of Manitoba has taken a forward step in making this application universal across the province. I recognize that the government in many instances because of their greater resources have made provisions for higher allotments but I still say that the basic principle between the former system and this is relatively the same--

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear! Hear!

MR. PAULLEY: And I'm sure that my honourable friend the Minister and I will argue this point, not only in this House. There's one thing however they are making a vast difference in, of the former situation in respect to the municipalities and the people is this, and it's something that we, of our group, assisted by the Conservatives when they were in opposition, tried to impress upon the former government without avail, and that is the provisions contained in the regulations whereby those people in need or on Social Assistance will eventually have a certificate or a card--call it whatever you will--which will entitle them at any time to go to a doctor or a dentist or optician in order to receive care, and I appreciate that very much. And I do sincerely trust and hope that 'ere long the negotiations that the Minister is conducting between the medical society and the other associations will be completed, because we've always maintained and I'm sure that this is the point that the Honourable Member for Gladstone was establishing this afternoon, that quite frequently that is the field of endeavour with which an individual who may be down on their heels, to use a vernacular, Mr. Chairman, requires the assistance by right and not without having to make applications on each individual time that they require it. So I say I'm not trying to belittle the endeavours of the Minister, I know that he is sincere; I know that he is doing a good job within the orbit of the financial resources of his department. But I do suggest to him that there is and will be--until there is another matter, and quite frankly I haven't one in my mind at the present time--but the basic principle, call it need or call it means, is the same today as it was when the Liberal Administration were in power here with the exception, they did not face up to their responsibilities; they did attempt in every case to foist on to the municipalities many of their obligations.

MR. CAMPBELL: And it's still the same thing. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister and the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party have been keeping at least for quite a while the--(interjection)--good, that will sure be welcome news because I never heard my honourable friend, even he, I have never heard take so long to try and dig himself out of the hole that he got into a little while ago there, in arguing with conviction, that this system that he was largely responsible for selling to my honourable friends on the other side, that it's just about the same thing that we had before.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, no. Not at all.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, it's exactly what he said. My honourable friend took a lot longer than that to say it and because--

MR. PAULLEY: That's because you wouldn't listen to it; that you're sitting where

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . you are--

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I admit that some of those reasons are true. But because my honourable friends did listen to you, they won't be sitting over there very long either.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, you won't be around--

MR. CAMPBELL: Because they listened to you on so many things. You led them astray and I don't like you to lead such a nice fellow as the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare so far astray because I, like my honourable friend, have a very high regard for the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, personally that is, not politically, and politically that was, too, before he changed.

MR. PAULLEY: What was he?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, he was on the side of the angels.

MR. PAULLEY: Our side.

MR. CAMPBELL: Until you folks led him astray. Well now, all I want to say at this stage, Mr. Chairman, and it won't take me long to say it--

MR. PAULLEY: Hear! Hear!

MR. CAMPBELL: I've been--you're the one that should say "hear! hear! eh? No one can accuse me on this department of having fought the election over again. I've kept pretty quiet.

MR. PAULLEY: You should too.

MR. CAMPBELL: No one can accuse me of trying to--well I could afford to stay quiet when you were arguing my side of the case. Why shouldn't I?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, boy, if I had your record I wouldn't even be up now.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend was making a fine defense of it a little while ago by saying that it was just the same as the one that he is praising here with my honourable friend--

MR. PAULLEY: You read Hansard tomorrow.

MR. CAMPBELL: But the one thing--that's going to be hard going but I'll try it just to see what my honourable friend did really come up with. The one thing I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that I agree that the system is changed but that the result is about the same except this, that we have this huge increase of which the Honourable the Minister spoke in the number of people and the activities of the department that he heads and at the same time I would be willing to place a bet that the Welfare Departments of the municipality of West Kildonan have not been reduced at all. The Welfare Department of the City of Winnipeg I would guess or even bet, have not been reduced at all.

MR. PAULLEY: hope not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of course. Of course they hope not. They want to see the Civil Service in both the province and the municipalities continuing to grow apace; that's part of their philosophy. But we said, and my honourable friend has argued this convincingly this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: why I tried to convince you before.

MR. CAMPBELL: We said that the way to do this job was to let the municipalities handle the additional area and now my honourable friend has arrived at the conclusion that that method and the new method which is so much more expensive with so many more civil servants in this department without any reduction in the municipal departments, my honourable friend says that they're just about the same thing.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, come, come.

MR. CAMPBELL: Come, come--nothing. That's what you said.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I did not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Chairman, the one question that I wanted to ask and I apologize for not having heard or understood the answer when the Honourable the Minister gave it, and I'm sure he has been over this one before, was: On this breakdown that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains asked on the \$6 million item--because I understood him to say when he started to give the figures that the first one of all that he gave of the expenditure under the four million six of a year ago, was approximately two million one for Mothers' Allowance. Was that correct?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Allowance the case, yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pardon?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Yes, I can give you that again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, my question in that, what I was wanting to get was that one particularly because going back not one year but two years, when it's set out by itself, I thought that the Mothers' Allowance was only about \$1.1 million or something of that order, and I wondered if there had been a mistake someplace in connection with that one.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in answering the questions--first of all--again this is purely political--I have the highest regard for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, but I would point out to him most sincerely and honestly as I can, that I do believe that if I were to spend some time on it that I could convince him further that we were getting to this stage and I touched on it briefly when I was talking about the whole area of alternative care, below the level of the hospital plan. Here was an area where our municipalities, and our expenditures, I would have forecast would have risen, and pretty well out of control in the next few years, had some attempt not been made to classify people in these various forms of alternative care facilities into some form of medical assessment. This is an experience which I am very familiar with. I can assure him that it's a big field and this is one of the reasons why we visualize this legislation where on April, 1958, the previous government went 80% straight reimbursement in this area with the implementation of the hospital plan, in order to prevent this vacuum which was created by 100% coverage of in-hospital patients, and leaving the municipalities to find the space for the other elements of medical care. This real vacuum was created and I would like him to know that one of the main provisions in these estimates is for these very people; these elderly, infirm, and so on as I went through in that estimate; this is one of the big bites in our \$6 million.

Secondly, I think he will agree that certain municipalities were certainly finding the long term high cost welfare cases under present cost arrangements becoming almost too much of a burden in some areas of the province. Also the provision for caring--medical care to certain elements in our society has grown like Topsy and I don't want to get into debate between state and socialized medicine. I'm against state medicine but certainly socialized medicine exists in many forms and categories in various areas of this province, and it has grown insidiously. And these things have come home to roost, and this is a sort of thing that we have to tackle in a very forthright manner and try and do a good job on. And we intend to try and do that in an equitable, fair manner, across the province with uniform legislation, and reduce this idea of the means test. In the 6.05 million I can break that down; how spent--in the Mothers' Allowance type of case across the province the figures given to me by my Deputy Minister, 2.17 million. If I recall the number of cases--I could get a breakdown on that--he could send that in. The provincial aged and infirmed, this was our responsibility; the relief and unorganized were the province's and municipality, and the provincial cases in municipalities, the transients and that sort of thing, half a million for a total of 3.3 million. Now, this is the group that we have covered in the past year with the reimbursement to the municipality of--this is purely provincial, I should say, expenditure.

Then we have in taking over--that comes to say 3.3 million roughly--in taking over the cost of the aged and infirmed and providing 1.85 million, and 1.6 million which is the cost of the provision of the Social Allowances Act. There's two items here, 1.85 million; 1.6 million; 3.3 million gives you 6.05 million. That's pretty well the breakdown in that group. As you know the Child Welfare is aside from that figure of six million. In other words, last year, in bringing down this estimate for five months, I gave the figure 4.684 million and then that was projected on the basis of five to six months of the new responsibility for the province. In taking it over for a 12-month period, the difference was 1.3 million I think I gave, that we added to this. Now of course the more we take over, the less reimbursement we give the municipalities and they have been getting a straight 80% reimbursement on aged and infirm care and as you know across the board. And we're just taking that over 100% for the purpose of trying to get some medical assessment into this, and to try and assist our hospital plan and also to relieve the municipalities of finding these resources for these people which they have found it so difficult to do. Now that is the breakdown I have. As I pointed out or tried to point out earlier when we added the money we spent in the past year in the department of 3.3 million, plus the program we have enacted for say February and March of this year, this fiscal year, we get a figure of 3.7 million which subtract from 4.6 million, which gave us \$950,000 then the money

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . not expended on neglected children due to the fact that we didn't proclaim the Act as early as we anticipated, we saved--we had this \$441,000 left over. These two added together comes to 1.4 million and our reimbursements to the municipalities which we voted only \$903,000 last year, for reimbursements to municipalities, if we give them another 1.4 million, it leaves a total of 2.3 million, which is roughly what we reimbursed municipalities or will reimburse municipalities in this previous vote. Of course this reimbursement has taken over more of this and we anticipate that this municipal reimbursement will go down.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't want to try to waste time of the committee on this matter and I will try and find my answer to this in Hansard, but I gather that the Minister said the Mothers' Allowance type of case--

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No, I've got it here, Mr. Chairman. I just found the exact breakdown on that.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have the estimates of two years ago when Mothers' Allowance is shown separately and it is \$1.11 million, and what I was trying to get was that I thought there must be some discrepancy because it would not have gone I would think from \$1.11 million to \$2.17 million. And I gather that there's some other cases in there as well. But then I understood the Minister to say that Child Welfare, there was some Child Welfare cases even in addition to that. My understanding was and I'm sure the Minister knows better than I on this but my understanding was that Mothers' Allowance is the usual name for what is really the Child Welfare Act. Isn't that correct? And to that extent they would be synonymous.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in these estimates I should--when I'm talking of neglected children I'm really thinking of ward maintenance. That's my error. Now the figures the Deputy Minister has given me, Mr. Chairman, are under the existing program previous to the proclamation, the former Mothers' Allowance; the debt and disability over four years; that is under the present provisions of the Act, the Child Welfare Act as it stands. The average of 1,400 families and \$129 a month comes to \$2,170,000 so that is the rise. That is just the Mothers' Allowance type in the estimates here and these all add up to that three million. Neglected children are or were the--previously as we recall, we reimbursed municipalities approximately \$600,000 a year for ward maintenance and we paid out approximately \$230,000 a year on our own wards, provincial and directors wards, and that is now of course being entirely transferred over.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Just one question, Mr. Chairman, please. I don't know whether I got these figures down right. I hope I have anyhow. The Mothers' Allowance is 2.1 million, just in round figures, and then the Minister mentioned provincial aid for those who are provincial responsibilities I believe. Is that right? 3.3 million?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): relief and unorganized.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: 3.3 million is the figure I've got here. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): What's the figure?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: 3.3 million.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well the total of the estimate is 2.17 million; \$500,000 on unorganized; \$195,000 in our provincial aged and infirm; and transients \$500,000, comes to a total of 3.365 million. And then--

MR. HRYHORCZUK: down further then and give us aged and infirmed, 1.6 million and so forth.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Yes.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Oh, I see.

MR. JOHNSON: The total is 3.3 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed. (a) (2), passed; (3), passed; (4) passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on (a)(3) just one or two more questions. Now we've had a pretty thorough discussion on the application form and some objecting to certain questions and others agreeing with it but I take it from the debates that have resulted over the application form that it is a fact that there may be a number of old people that just can't comprehend the import of the application but that won't disqualify him if he fills out his name and address and a couple of other questions and sends it in. That will be sufficient to assure that a social worker will go out. So that settles that one. Then we had a pretty thorough

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) .. discussion and I don't think it has been settled yet as to the difference between means test and need, but this might assist some of the members here. I have a letter from the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowances Board and it's dated February 12th, and this lady applied for a pension under the Old Age Assistance program. She expected to get \$55 a month, but because of her assets it was reduced to \$44.21. She expected \$55 so immediately now I understand she will apply under the social allowances for a further \$10.79 so she'll get--perhaps she'll get up to the \$55. She seems to think that with \$55, she could get by, so she'll get \$44.21 under the means test application and perhaps \$10.79. And everybody will be satisfied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4, passed; 5, passed; 6, passed; 7, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on 5, could the Minister give us details as to which ones these apply to? Is that grants to charitable institutions? What is the breakdown there?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): This is up as you see \$86,000 since last year. The increase is made up of the grants of \$35,000 more to our Children's Aid Society. We have the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg of central, eastern and western Manitoba and these are the--the Children's Aid Society really acts as a Director of Child Welfare in these jurisdictions--central, eastern and western Manitoba. The bursaries to societies, this is the Society for Crippled Children and to the four children's aid societies, \$17,000; Rheumatism and Arthritis Society, \$4,700; Society for Crippled Children and Adults, this is to assist them with central in one place \$1,800; Multiple Sclerosis Society; Canadian Mental Health--a portion of their grant comes out of here--this appropriation. Children's institutions and old folks' homes, this is where we give \$100 a year to allow the sales tax exemption on charitable institutions. The Berens River Hospital, and I just caught this the other day, and I imagine this will be deleted now that Berens River is under the hospital plan but this year it probably--I'll have to check on that. Grace Hospital and Misericordia, they got \$2,000 grants for the pre-natal work. Age and Opportunity Bureau--all these items are included in here. Part of the increase is due to new elderly persons' housing also. Some new ones have increased the grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6, passed; 7, passed.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us very briefly, very, very briefly, what this item consists of.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The Alcoholism Foundation you mean; that's \$65,000.

MR. ORLIKOW: for?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): What's it for? The annual report pretty well spells it out--exactly what it's for. That's for the maintenance of Nassau House and the staff--about \$24,000 of that is in the staff at the Alcoholism Centre--Foundation Centre, plus the operation of Nassau House as the annual report points out, plus courses--they send a couple of psychiatrists I think every year to Yale University School of Post-Graduate Alcohol Studies, plus literature they obtain, plus certain medical and welfare costs which are minimal but nonetheless listed. And this is pretty well what their budget consists of. I have a more detailed breakdown but the Honourable member can find that all in the annual report. I had hoped to distribute to honourable members an interim report on the Foundation bringing it up to the end of December, plus a statement on the function and duties of Nassau House. I asked my department to distribute that during my Welfare estimates--probably going to be a little late now. The reason I asked for that was because of the questions asked at the last session where I have in the past year met with the Board on four occasions to register--to try and familiarize myself more clearly with the policy and objectives of the foundation and their feeling is, in general terms, that as the public become more aware of their purpose and objectives of Nassau House, as more treatment as they try and reach the profession with the idea of right after the acute treatment--the patient should be referred for counselling or for rehabilitation assistance in Nassau House that that is really the objective of their educational program and the rest of their program is designed at teaching. Now I think that the foundation is performing a very worthwhile function and a very real need. I've been assured of this by the man who founded AA in this province and he has repeatedly told me of the worthiness of a project of this nature. For instance the medical advisory staff of this foundation sit down with the administrators of the hospitals to try and point out to them the need for the admission of the acute alcoholic to the acute hospital facility and they try and explain the nature of the illness and the need for sympathetic and early care

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . . in these hospitals. They also do a lot of speaking to lay bodies. The other night one of the counsellors spent four hours with a victim of alcoholism, trying to assist him in seeking lodgings. It is against the policy of Nassau House to take anyone in who has been drinking or is under the influence and they don't want it to be known as a drying out centre. They feel that people coming in there have to be pretty well determined or have some desire to want to quit or cease their former habits and I have had assurances from many members of AA that given a little more time this function will grow and the usefulness will become more and more apparent to the community as a whole. I think we'll see in the interim report which I asked the foundation to give me to explain this more clearly to the honourable members where they had more people through Nassau House this past year, where they are really trying to do some very real tangible work. They are also doing some research this year into the causes of alcoholism. As they point out to me, as the Board points out, to explain a program of this nature, to talk about it, to give definitive information and so on is very difficult, because alcoholism is such an intangible thing to talk about. It is so hard to show their real results or what they do achieve. Now I feel that my function as Minister with respect to the activities of the foundation is one of trying to interpret this to the House. They have a very fine and influential board, and I can assure the House that I think there is real concern to try and make members feel that they are spending this as honestly as they can and are trying to achieve something in a very difficult field. That's really all I can say.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I asked the question not because I had any particular criticism of this item, but I am concerned with the fact we have money in three different departments. In this department, in the education department and in the Attorney-General's Department. Now I am not objecting to the spending of the money. I would say, let's spend two times or ten times the money if we really feel that the money is being spent so that it will actually reduce the increasing number of alcoholics and possibly prevent people who might become alcoholics from following that course. I must say, however, Mr. Chairman, that I am not convinced that all the money which we are spending is being spent wisely. I don't often disagree with members of this group, but I must say that I disagree with the attitude taken with the member for Inkster that just to spend money, and he has said this on a number of occasions, will solve the problem. And I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a long speech about this--I would like to see an inter-departmental committee of the three departments which are now spending money, set up to evaluate the work which is being done. It may be that they will report that we need to spend more money or the same amount of money or less money, but I would like to see an evaluation of the work which is being done so that the members of this Committee could be assured that what needs to be done is being done and that projects which possibly are being done and are of not much use may be discontinued at some time in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a), passed; (b)(1), passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we are still on that subject; last year we had a number of questions on this item and at that time there was quite a controversy apparently going on between a number of people as to whether this Nassau House was doing the job that it should. Now I appreciate the report that the Minister has given us. I regret that it wasn't given to us a little earlier because it is somewhat difficult to discuss an item when you have just received this two minutes before. Now I notice here that there has been an increase this year. Last year, according to the newspaper reports at that time and as I recall it, the statement of the Minister--there had been 17 patients in the home. And I notice here on page two that it says there have been 42 residents of Nassau House, 11 in 1958. Well that doesn't quite agree with what we had but anyway it doesn't make that much difference, and 31 in 1959. Now the average period of residence was fractionally over 21 days in 1959. Now based on 31 people, that would be something in the order of two a day. Now how much space is available there in Nassau House? What is the staff at the moment? And does the Minister consider that the average of two persons per day is a satisfactory and sufficient result for the amount of expenditure that is being incurred here?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in answering this question, as I have said previously, I spoke to the Board on three or four occasions now concerning the policy of Nassau House and the concern of the members as was expressed last session which appeared in certain

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . newspaper stories that this was a very infrequently inhabited premises. The story is that there are two people residing in Nassau House permanently, where a salary is paid, a cook and an attendant and it is true that the occupancy was very low at the beginning. This thing started not too long ago, as you know. And the policy however, of Nassau House was pointed out very clearly by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the former Provincial Psychiatrist, in pointing out that it could not be a drying out centre. Its success depended on the education of the medical men of the province trying to bring to their attention the facility which exists here; that ideally this is the place to which these men should be referred following acute treatment in an acute hospital; that they couldn't begin to introduce into this place people who were as they say in a--it was not to be made a drying out centre. They pointed out very clearly that, although last year we had very few in there, that of that number that were in, there were some real wonderful results where in four or five cases, families were reunited; where fathers had become again successful salesmen and businessmen and re-established themselves and the board felt that in itself was justification for their policy and their objectives. They are only too careful to point out that this will take time. They point out in Toronto, a large city of that size, that they only had until this last spring I believe-- whether they have changed it, I don't know--a similar type of facility which only accommodated 30 people at any one time. This is of a capacity of ten or 13 I believe. I have been over there on a couple of occasions and this has been pointed out to me, that this, they hoped, would become more and more well-known. They are enlarging their medical coverage to medical personnel and social workers and so on. The number of enquiries that go through there is really astounding; the number of people who have a problem and give them a call.

I, as Minister, don't know how much more I can say. I am just assured by the very large board plus the medical advisory committee that this is a very worthwhile venture; that they do expect that this occupancy will increase; that they are looking constantly at their objectives and meeting the needs of this group of people. I really don't know what more I can say on that. In this present year incidentally, I think their expenditures--in last session we voted \$65,000--I think for this year they will probably spend about \$45,000. They haven't asked for another \$20,000 in this fiscal year but in the coming year they are extending their research project and feel that they will require the full amount of money.

I might inform the House that Manitoba's alcoholics, according to these figures estimated at 1420 per 100,000, which on the basis of present population would mean in the neighbourhood of 12,000. And they say in addition to this another 10,000 are problem drinkers. Six out of every 100 gainfully employed in Canada are alcoholics, and on the average they absent themselves from employment 18.7 work days per year. It is considered by such authorities as Dr. John , World Health and Dr. Andrew Ivy of the University of Illinois as ranking next to heart and cancer in its toll in American society. Manitoba, he says, is beginning to come to grips with the problem in areas of treatment, prevention and research. The primary objective of this foundation is the treatment and rehabilitation of the alcoholic and the program is trying to inform the public the nature and extent of the problem and treatment of the alcoholic by informing--trying to reach the medical profession to inform them and to get their sympathetic consideration and to provide--do what they can as a group of medical advisory people and so on to constantly keep before the hospital authorities the need for the sympathetic approach to these people. And they are trying to develop follow-up services through such facilities as the out-patients of our hospitals, the psychopathic hospital and the Nassau House Treatment Centre.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, there is only one question after listening to the Honourable the Member from St. John's. I think that he said something that was really worthwhile and -- what is the reaction of the Minister on that? That is to try and get those three departments together to find out what is being done in this field of alcohol.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I believe this is, Mr. Chairman, receiving the consideration of the First Minister at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) -- Passed. (3) -- Passed. (b) 4 -- Passed. (c) (1) -- Passed. (c) (2) -- Passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Were we not back on 3(a) (5)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. MOLGAT: 3 - (7) I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3 (c).

MR. MOLGAT: Well when did you call (b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We called 3 and (b) and now we're on to (c).

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't see how we get suddenly from (a) (7) to (c) (1). That's the part I don't quite understand. What happened to (b) (1), (2), (3) and (4)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well we finished (a), 3(a) and 3(b) and we've now called No. 2 of 3(b).

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make this observation, that we had been proceeding through (a) 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., and if everyone is agreeable we might call it (b) 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the same way. I think perhaps the members didn't know that they were going by and I wonder if you would be willing to -- I am going to make this suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that we might have come to the end of a digestible piece of business when we are finished with (a) and that if the House were willing we might suggest the committee rise now and begin next time with Section (b). Is that agreeable to the other groups?

MR. MOLGAT: That would seem agreeable to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Before the committee rises, Mr. Chairman, call (b). I think, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps we could take this ground that before the members over there recovered themselves at any progress being made at all that we had gone on past it and they might like to go back. I wonder if I might announce now, give notice now that the Private Bills Committee will meet on Friday morning at 9.00 o'clock in Room 232(B). A notice will appear in the Votes and Proceedings which will be on the desks tomorrow. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, at this time I would be willing to move that the committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: inform the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply would like to make a report of progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2.30 Thursday afternoon.

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	Geo. Wm. Johnson	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Robert Gordon Smellie	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	Beausejour, Man.
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	Edmond Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	J. E. Ingebrigtsen	Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Mrs. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 5
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q.C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Peter Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 5
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Box 2, Group 517, R.R. 5
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 9
LA VERENDRYE	Stan Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Walter Weir	Minnedosa, Man.
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Obie Baizley	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
PEMBINA	Hon. Maurice E. Ridley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	John Aaron Christianson	15 Dufferin W. Ptge 1a Prairie, Man.
RADISSON	Russell Paulty	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q.C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	David Orlikow	206 Ethelbert St., Winnipeg 10
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Wpg. 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q.C.	Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	Lot 87 River Road, Lockport, Man.
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	A. H. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	E. I. Dow	Boissevain, Man.
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan	512A, Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1