

*Unemployment Assistance*

back to the province from which he came. That contention is further borne out by the provisions of section 10 (c) of the agreement which sets out the exceptions, as follows:

(c) all travelling expenses—

And then the subclause:

(i) returning a recipient of unemployment assistance and his dependents, if any, to his normal place of residence—

If a province were under agreement and received an application from a person who had lately come into the province, there is no stipulation here as to a time limit. The province could provide for a limit of five years if it wished, but a person who was within the time limit stipulated by the province might come from another province where there was no agreement with the federal authorities. He could be returned to that province and the federal government would share in the cost of returning that man and his family from the place where he had made application for assistance to his place of original residence. If I interpret this correctly, and I think I do, it means that it cannot definitely be said that there is no condition of residence, because it could be altered in every province that has an agreement with the federal government simply by stating the length of time during which it would accept responsibility for those people. That could be particularly true where the province of original domicile was not one having an agreement with the federal government.

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Chairman, the minister may recall that yesterday at the resolution stage I asked whether there would be any ceiling or floor in regard to payments to be made under the legislation to follow the resolution, and the minister replied there would not. I should like to ask him one or two further questions on that subject. I am wondering what consideration, if any, was given to that particular question in the discussions with the provinces, and with particular reference to the question of some form of ceiling or floor on the level of assistance that would be required to be paid if the federal government would participate.

I think perhaps the situation is highlighted somewhat by the contrast in rates that would be payable under the retroactive arrangement as between British Columbia and Newfoundland. I am not suggesting that there is any likelihood of there being an influx of people from Newfoundland to British Columbia. However, for the sake of argument let us suppose there was a contrast in rates as between British Columbia, which was paying \$30, and the neighbouring province of Alberta

[Mrs. Fairclough.]

where the rate to be paid was \$11. In that case it would seem to me there would be a likelihood of a large influx into British Columbia as a result. While it is perfectly true that as far as the federal share is concerned it might increase the liability of the federal government, it is also true that it would materially increase the liability of that particular provincial government.

I am wondering whether there was not some general understanding reached among the provinces, at least those which are neighbouring provinces, as to some approximate level of minimum or maximum rates that will be paid. If not, what are the reasons for the decision? As far as the federal authorities are concerned there would be no provision made for a floor under the level of payments to the provinces that qualify.

**Mr. Martin:** I cannot add anything. What my hon. friend has said is right, but if we are going to avoid residence as a qualification—and I know my hon. friend will agree with that—you cannot do anything about it. You can only trust to the good sense of most people of this country, which I think is sound. There would be some people who would move from a lower rate province to a higher rate province, but I think that disadvantage is certainly countered by the great advantages of the terms of this legislation, so far as no residence qualification is concerned.

**Mr. Knight:** People going from the Liberal provinces to other provinces?

**Mr. Martin:** I would not want to make a political observation at this time.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I think what has taken place here today indicates that when there is too much rush in the examination of legislation difficulties arise. I think the time that has been made available to the house and the committee to review and consider this bill has been altogether too limited, and further limited by the fact that the bill was not made available until quite late this forenoon.

I have looked over this bill and it is unusual in many ways. Strangely enough there are no explanatory notes. Strangely enough there is nothing to indicate the need of uniformity, outside of the special case of the province of Nova Scotia. The bill as it is now constituted would leave the door wide open to the minister and the government to enter into agreements with other provinces that have not yet joined, to enter into agreements that would be materially different from those already entered into. The hon. gentleman shakes his head in the negative