

Vote No. 634, for \$1,425,000, is explained by the fact that the number of veterans who applied for benefits under the Veterans' Land Act was larger than had been anticipated.

As I intimated before, honourable senators, I am not attempting to explain every individual item. I have covered the larger ones. If any additional information is required it could probably best be secured through the respective committees to which the estimates have been referred.

Hon. Mr. Leger: I understand that the reason for Vote No. 587, which is for a small amount, is that the Internal Economy Committee of the Senate had not passed the customary motion.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: That may be the reason why the amount was not included last year.

Hon. John T. Haig: It is; I know.

Honourable members, I hope not to delay the house at any length. This bill is, of course, not in the same category as the second supply bill that is to come before us today. The second one is simply to grant supply for the coming two months, but the bill now before us covers moneys that will be expended between now and the 31st of March. The surprising thing is that this bill asks for \$65 million in addition to the sum that we voted a little more than three months ago.

I do not intend to deal with this bill as a budget matter, but I think there are two or three things about it that ought to be drawn to the attention of honourable members. For instance, some of the items in it are fore-runners of similar items that will be appearing before us often in the next three or four years. One such item is vote No. 570, on the first page of the schedule. The honourable the minister (Hon. Mr. Robertson) did not explain this, but apparently the reason for the vote is that the government guaranteed certain products and has carried them at a loss. The amount here is \$350,000, not a very large sum, but important because, as I say, it is likely to be the first of a number of similar votes that we shall be asked to make in the next three or four years. So we had better get used to this kind of thing.

I was hoping the minister would give a full explanation of the vote to provide for our contribution to the International Refugee Organization. I do not remember that this came up last year at all, and there has never been much discussion of it in this house.

Hon. Mr. Robertson: Which vote is that?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Vote No. 574.

Vote No. 581 provides an amount of \$1 under the annuities Act. I cannot understand this practice of asking for a vote of \$1, and I was hoping there would be an explanation. Apparently the government requires that vote in order to cover money already expended. The only conclusion that I can come to is that it is merely a token vote.

Vote No. 583, the government's contribution to the Unemployment Insurance Fund, is for a further amount of \$2,500,000. Honourable members must bear in mind that it was only last November when the vote to cover the government's contribution to this fund was passed in another place, and it was passed here as late as December. It seems to me that \$2,500,000 is a terrific increase of expenditure to have occurred within the short space of about four months. When we voted the previous amount, eight months of the year had gone by, and this request for an additional \$2,500,000 indicates that there must have been a tremendous increase in unemployment during the intervening period. Over the radio and in the newspapers the government has constantly denied that there was any unemployment at all, although, of course, we all knew there was considerable. Here, as I say, we have what appears to be definite proof.

The second vote under the Unemployment Insurance Act, Vote No. 584, is for payment of unemployment assistance to residents of Newfoundland. I had probably better be careful in what I am about to state here, but I will say to my friends from Newfoundland that we are married to that island and we certainly have got a pretty expensive bride. I will not go any further than that at the moment.

Hon. Mr. McKeen: And you are on the Divorce Committee.

Hon. Mr. Haig: No, I am not. I salute you and say that I am not. A number of distinguished members of this house—lawyers from Ottawa and other parts of the country—have taken my place on that committee, and I am now free to criticize anything the committee may do.

Hon. Mr. McKeen: Do you think the committee has improved?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I think it has much improved.

There is a third item under the Unemployment Insurance Act, Vote No. 585, for \$1,500,000, to reimburse the Unemployment Insurance Fund. To me that is an indication that the government recognizes the existence of unemployment all over the country. There is no doubt that unemployment such as we have had during this past winter should be the responsibility of the Dominion of Canada. If the federal government continues to choose