

*Unemployment Assistance*

opportunity to get into the positive class in so far as figures are concerned. Then, of course, the minister could be extremely happy. He would have sold a bill of goods to the Canadian people to show that he is looking after 50 per cent of the unemployment costs when, in actual fact, if some efforts were extended along that line he could get along without spending anything.

It is easy enough to talk about whose responsibility the problem of the hard core is. To say that the people at the municipal level know their neighbours and know what hardship arises and that they are the people who can carry on the job is ridiculous. How ridiculous can they get, Mr. Chairman? This government is the body that is collecting practically every cent it can get from everyone. Then it is attempting to get by, by putting on someone else the responsibility of looking after people out of real property taxes.

Those taxes were never designed at any time to take care of people in this category. They were designed to provide the services, the educational costs, the fire protection and the police protection. Certainly real estate was not designed to assume this burden. What happens? What do you do? This government takes as much of the taxes as it can possibly get. It brings new people into the country and the first time they get a pay cheque the government makes doubly sure that it gets its share but it leaves it to the municipality to build the schools, to provide the roads, the police protection and the fire services for them right away, and the municipalities do not get any tax revenue from those people until long after they have arrived.

I mentioned education. It is probably the most important of all, because it is one thing that must be looked after for all the people, and we must provide for them the best education we can. As I said this afternoon, sooner or later we are going to have to make a permanent division of the sources of taxes in this country and leave the responsibility of disbursing them with the people who collect the taxes. Only then will we catch up with this problem.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** Just let me finish, will you please?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** All right, I would like to ask it then.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** I notice that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration had his conference outside and got his answer

[Mr. Hamilton (York West).]

across here very well through his spokesman, so perhaps he would let me finish my remarks.

It is very easy to see why the province of Ontario has not accepted this formula as yet, because obviously there is going to be no contribution to that province under present conditions; and if the municipalities are now all bearing a share they will continue to bear it. None of them has the revenue to take care of even one unemployed person. This legislation is a very nice thing to sell to the people; it sounds as if we are doing a great deal, but in actual fact we are doing practically nothing to ease the burden on the municipal governments.

I would like to refer again to the technical problem I brought up before the dinner hour; perhaps there is an answer to it, but I would like to hear some of the lawyer members of the house express an opinion concerning it. Clause 4, subclause 1(e) of the bill, is worded in a way which would indicate that it was the intention to continue this legislation for a fixed period and then from year to year. I would assume this would be done on a 12-month basis from whatever time the agreement was signed. Clause 17 of the agreement indicates that the agreement can be terminated one year from any date. The minister has said that by attaching this agreement to the legislation it would clear up any apparent inconsistency, but it does not seem quite right to me yet, sir. Surely it is not the intention—

**Mr. Martin:** May I just point out that my hon. friend mentioned this matter this afternoon. We have now passed that clause and we can look at it again when we come to third reading, but I do not think we are in order in discussing it now. I shall be pleased to discuss it again on third reading.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** Why is it out of order to look at clause 4?

**Mr. Martin:** We have passed it.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** No, we have not passed clause 4.

**Mr. Martin:** We have passed the amendment to clause 3 by which my hon. friend was provoked to make his observation.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** That may be so, but I am now dealing with clause 4, subclause 1(e), and if in fact the amendment which was passed does not clear up this confusion then this is the proper time to discuss it.

As I see it, it does not seem reasonable, notwithstanding the explanation that has been given, that one of the contracting parties could give notice in the middle of the year and end this agreement to its advantage at a time of high or low unemployment, as the