

*Unemployment Assistance*

**Mr. Carter:** The hon. member for Peel is the member I meant.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** I wonder whether the minister will explain the meaning of clause 4(3)(b) of the bill, bearing in mind that clause 4(2) says:

Except as provided in subsection (3), an agreement shall, for the purposes of this act, exclude from unemployment assistance costs—

And so on; and then (b):

Payments made to or on behalf of persons—

And so on. Then subclause 3 says:

An agreement may include as unemployment assistance costs

(b) relief payments made to or on behalf of the persons referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (2)—

And so on. In other words, subclause 3(b) says that those persons may be included in the computation who are specifically excluded in subclause 2(b). Will the minister please explain that.

**Mr. Martin:** I explained that a moment ago, but I suppose my explanation was not as clear as I hoped it would be. Under subclause (2) (b) or under all the subclauses (a) (b) (c) (d) and so on there are provisions which are taken outside the legislation. My hon. friend directs my attention specifically to (2) (b). The governing part is:

Except as provided in subsection (3), an agreement shall, for the purposes of this act, exclude from unemployment assistance costs

(b) payments made to or on behalf of persons who are in receipt of financial assistance under any act of the legislature of a province the cost of which is shared by Canada under an act of the parliament of Canada other than this act, and payments made by way of supplemental allowance or cost of living bonus to those persons or to persons who are in receipt of financial assistance under any act of the parliament of Canada.

Then subclause 3 (b) is the exception:

An agreement may include as unemployment assistance costs

Then (b):

relief payments made to or on behalf of the persons referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) in addition to the payments herein specified.

These are relief payments, as I said a moment ago. I took the case of the three western provinces where supplementary payments are made to old age assistance. As far as the moneys paid by way of old age assistance or supplementary benefits are concerned, they do not qualify under this legislation. Simply by way of parenthesis may I say that these supplementary payments are made to a special group of people, the recipients of old age assistance; but if on top of that a province pays public assistance to a wide group of citizens, including this particular group, to the extent of that additional assistance over

and above the supplementary payments and the old age assistance itself the federal government, under this legislation, is prepared to share in the cost of that extra assistance provision.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Then this is merely a subsistence payment, is it; food, lodging, and so forth?

**Mr. Martin:** That is right.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Heat, and so on?

**Mr. Martin:** That is right.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** As differentiated from any amounts paid to them as pensions or old age security payments?

**Mr. Martin:** Or supplementary payments.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Handicapped persons' allowances, and so on?

**Mr. Martin:** That is right.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Now that the minister has explained it, it becomes a little clearer; but I must say it is a very badly drawn piece of legislation.

**Mr. Hamilton (York West):** As I look at the clock I think there is an object lesson here for the minister. Because you are fast off the mark it does not mean you are going to win a fast race.

This matter of when bills come to us came up before. I might repeat, sir, that even though they require a date and a number it seems to me that the officials of the department have them prepared long in advance. I ask again that some consideration be given to having them sent around in draft form so this last minute examination might not be necessary, and perhaps the minister would get along a little better than he has tonight.

I cannot help but think that the remarks made by the hon. member for Hamilton West, added to by the hon. member for Peel, confirm to a great extent what I said on second reading of this bill, namely that in so far as the province from which I come is concerned, this bill does absolutely nothing at the present time. If I understand the figures as I heard them read out it would appear that the idea is to indicate that Ontario is going to be permanently in a state of prosperity. If I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo, according to these figures Newfoundland will continue to be in a period of depression.

The hon. member for Peel has certainly indicated that the government might seriously consider whether some additional measures are not required to see that those other areas of the country, whether it be by decentralization of industry or otherwise, are given an