

Unemployment Assistance

by the province to be on their public assistance rolls. We are seeking authorization under this bill to pay not more than 50 per cent, and that money would be paid directly to the province.

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): It would be the responsibility of the province to determine whether it would be paid to the individual or to the institution?

Mr. Blair: I come back again to clause 3 of the bill, and I still think there will be confusion under that section. In the first place the word "inmates" is used. The usual meaning, at least to me, of that word is a person who has been committed to an institution. If it is a mental institution he would be committed on the certificates of doctors. Or an individual might be sent there by a municipality because he was suffering from some form of chronic trouble. Otherwise the word "patient" should be used.

I come back again to nursing homes. You might find people there who are there simply because they are old. You will find other people there who have been transferred from hospitals because there is not room in the hospitals for them. It may be less expensive to go into the so-called nursing home.

Then you have various classifications here. You speak of institutions for incurables. Some people are in nursing homes because they are incurable and cannot be taken care of at home. They might occupy a bed in a hospital, and it is more expensive for them to be there. To my mind there are three or four classes of patients, and I think in carrying out this legislation sooner or later there will be difficulty in interpreting 3 (a).

Mr. Martin: I always rely greatly on what my hon. friend says, but I am sure that if he will look at the Ontario nursing act he will find precise provisions to cover these cases. We may have some difficulty but, if so, we will have to bring it back for amendment.

Mr. Nicholson: The minister has the advantage of legal training. While the hon. member for Prince Albert seems to be satisfied, I would ask the minister to clear up for those of us who have not been through law school the distinction between 2 (a) and 3 (a), so we will not have any trouble in explaining this to lay people.

Mr. Martin: Subclause 2 (a) and subclause 3 (a) are not to be contrasted. Subclause 2 (a) simply says the following are excluded, while 3 (a) says that if individuals are in homes for special care, notwithstanding the above, they may be included provided they come within the definition in subclause 4 which defines what is a home for special care.

Mr. Trainor: This provides that if the money is paid by the province or the municipality directly to the hospital, the institution is not eligible. When it is paid to the individual, then the institution becomes eligible. It seems to me that this will greatly encourage the use of subterfuge on the part of municipal and provincial governments, which might switch from a method of financial support directly to the institution to the individual, and in that case the individual would be required to pay directly to the institution.

Mr. Martin: This is not a scheme to provide assistance to the individual. If a province did what my hon. friend suggests of course we would have to point that out to it.

Mr. Zaplitny: Subclause 4 defines the meaning of homes for special care. I should like a further clarification of that subclause which reads:

In this section, the expression "homes for special care" means nursing homes, hostels for indigent transients, homes for the aged, poor houses, alms houses and hostel facilities provided for the aged within housing projects constructed under the National Housing Act.

Do the words "within housing projects constructed under the National Housing Act" refer to the whole subclause or only to what comes after the word "and" in the third line of the subclause?

Mr. Martin: After the word "and".

Mr. Zaplitny: They do not refer to any words before that?

Mr. Martin: No.

Mr. Bell: If that is the answer to the question perhaps the draftsman might decide to put in a comma after the word "almshouses" just to clarify the subclause.

Mr. Martin: I think that is a good suggestion. I may say that was put in at the request of Saskatchewan where they have some of these homes.

Mrs. Fairclough: I am still concerned about the remarks the minister made earlier with regard to chronic cases. When he was replying to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni he said that chronic cases would be taken care of under clause 4(3) (a), which reads:

An agreement may include as unemployment assistance costs—

And then later:
—and who would not normally be cared for in general, acute, chronic or convalescent hospitals—

Then the agreement in section 8(a)(iv), which is the long paragraph to which I drew the minister's attention earlier, says in part:
together with any payment made to or on behalf of such person, who is—