

## Unemployment Assistance

case might be. It seems to me what was intended here was a continuation of this agreement in periods of 12 months after the original agreement was signed. I feel there may be some confusion in connection with that matter at the present time.

**Mr. Martin:** Perhaps I did not understand the suggestion made by my hon. friend earlier. Is my hon. friend suggesting we make clause 4, subclause 1(e) conform, as it must, to the agreement, because we have an agreement that may be changed; I mean, it could be changed. Is my hon. friend suggesting that the clause of the bill with regard to termination notice should conform to clause 17 of the agreement?

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** That is right.

**Mr. Martin:** Clause 17 of the agreement reads:

This agreement shall be deemed to have come into force and shall bind the parties from the -- day of -- 19 , and thereafter until terminated by either party giving to the other party one year's notice in writing.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** That is right.

**Mr. Martin:** I would agree with that. I did not appreciate the point raised by the hon. member earlier. I would ask the Minister of National Defence if he would now move that clause 4, subclause 1(e), which reads—

Fix the time of the agreement at not more than five years and thereafter from year to year subject to termination by either party.

—be amended by adding thereto the words “on one year's notice in writing”.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** I think, Mr. Chairman, it might be done by deleting all the words after “thereafter” and substituting therefor the words “until terminated by either party giving to the other party one year's notice in writing”.

**Mr. Martin:** That is acceptable. Would my hon. friend move that?

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** Yes.

**Mr. Martin:** I thank my hon. friend.

**The Deputy Chairman:** It has been moved by Mr. Pickersgill—

**Mr. Fleming:** It was moved by Mr. Hamilton.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Campney.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Hamilton.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Mr. Hamilton (York West) moves:

—that all the words after “thereafter” in the seventeenth line be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

“until terminated by either party giving to the other party one year's notice in writing”.

I am inserting the words “in the seventeenth line” for clarity.

**Mr. Carrick:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a word or two at this stage. It seems to me the government has attempted to solve a very real problem in introducing this legislation. All hon. members will remember the difficulty that most of us experienced last year when there was considerable unemployment during the winter season and the people who were entitled to some assistance from either the municipal, the provincial or the federal level were unable to obtain it.

The difficulty in each case was that at that time there did not seem to be any way in which the three levels of government were able to get together and see that assistance was given. This legislation should certainly have the effect of making it impossible for any level of government to say that it is not responsible for the assistance that is needed within the class of cases covered by this legislation.

This legislation has the virtue of abolishing a distinction that has been troublesome throughout the history of the administration of unemployment assistance; that is the distinction which has always existed as between persons who were unemployed and not capable of being employed and persons who were employable.

There has been introduced in this debate some discussion which really turns upon the fiscal relations between the provinces and the dominion. As all hon. members know, there is other legislation before the house at this time which deals with that, and everyone who has endeavoured to ascertain what are the proper payments to make to the provinces and what are the proper sources of revenue is constantly aware of the complex nature of this problem. It is obviously impossible for the government at this time to endeavour to change immediately the traditional relations between the municipalities, the provinces and the federal government.

The hon. member for York West has referred to the difficulties the municipalities have experienced and with which we are all familiar; but this legislation, of course, has to proceed on the basis that that relationship is in existence at the present time, and it is an attempt to take care of a group that is going to need help under the existing relations.

It is inevitable in legislation of this kind that having laid down the general principle as to all persons who will be entitled to assistance, those persons who will not be