

*Blind Persons Act*

they must use it subject to the opinion that is expressed in the report itself as to its value. If they wish to be honest and to be thought to be honest throughout this country they would draw to the people's attention the limitations placed on this report by the authors themselves.

In the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia a great deal was said about \$100 a month. Then, in his remarks the hon. member who has just spoken asked whether \$10 was a reasonable amount by which to supplement these pensions. I thought I might place on the record some of the facts with regard to this matter. I have a survey of the situation as it was in 1961. Going from east to west we find that Newfoundland provides aid through general assistance as required. I have no information with regard to Prince Edward Island. Nova Scotia provides aid through general assistance as required, as does New Brunswick. Quebec instituted a program in 1961 which provides up to \$10 per month across the province, up to \$25 a month in cities and towns and up to \$40 a month in metropolitan centres. Total maximum payments thus range from \$65 to \$95.

The situation in Ontario is that the province shares in additional payments by municipalities up to \$20 a month. Manitoba provides aid through the program of social allowances on a budget deficit basis. Allowances depend on expenditures for various budgetary items up to set maxima. I will skip Saskatchewan for the time being. In 1961 the situation in British Columbia was that a provincial supplementary allowance program provided aid to recipients of old age security, old age assistance, blind persons allowances and disabled persons allowances up to \$24 a month on a means test basis. British Columbia has now instituted a new plan effective January 1, 1962. In 1961 the situation in Alberta was that there was a provincial supplementary allowance to recipients of old age security, old age assistance and blind persons allowances up to \$15 a month on a means test basis.

Let us look at the Saskatchewan situation, the home of the C.C.F. whose members are making all the noise in the far corner of the house. In 1961 there was a provincial supplementary allowance to recipients of old age security or blind persons allowances—I know hon. members will be interested to hear the amount—of \$2.50 a month where total income did not exceed \$900. Where income was less than \$65 a month supplementation was provided to bring the income up to this amount. Thus the maximum supplementation for a single person was \$10 a month. We have payments of \$24 a month in British Columbia

[Mr. Jones.]

and \$14 a month in Alberta alongside this situation in Saskatchewan which I have described.

Under the spur and inspiration of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, who has done such a wonderful job in his department, the provinces have instituted what they call a budget deficit program of payments whereby budgets are drawn up so that the needs of the recipients are tested according to an accepted formula in each of the provinces.

**Mr. Peters:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member relating what he is saying to the blind pensions debate? I ask this question because he referred to a speech made by the hon. member for Assiniboia last night on this subject, who did not speak on this subject at all but rather on another subject altogether. I am wondering whether the figures the hon. member is giving are related to the allowances given to blind persons by the various provinces.

**Mr. Jones:** Apparently the hon. member has not been listening to what I have been saying. I will give the figures again as to the situation in Saskatchewan. In 1961 there was a provincial supplemental allowance to recipients of old age security or blind persons allowances of \$2.50 where total income did not exceed \$900. I think that is related to blind persons. As I have mentioned, as a result of the inspiration of our Minister of National Health and Welfare a budget deficit basis has been accepted throughout most of the country as a proper basis for providing these allowances. Under the inspiration of the Conservative Minister of National Health and Welfare Saskatchewan has altered the situation there. Effective April 1, 1961, their supplemental allowances were placed on a budget deficit basis. Allowances depend on expenditures for various budgetary items up to set maxima. In general, a single person can be assisted up to \$75.65 plus an amount for fuel.

I think hon. members will perhaps be interested in knowing what the actual maxima are for the various items for a single person. The amounts are as follows: Food, \$23.50; shelter, \$35; clothing, \$5.50; light and cooking, \$6; water, \$2.75; household supplies and laundry, \$1.30; personal care, \$1.60, making a total of \$75.65, plus an allowance for fuel. One just has to go to the province of Alberta to find that in general a person there can be assisted up to the amount of \$80.70 plus an amount for fuel.

I thought that placing these figures on the record might help to straighten out the situation.