

dignity on the part of the minister in expressing himself in this manner. I do not think it becomes a minister of the crown. The minister has been referred to in the press as a "tough guy" for this reason. To say the least, it casts a slur on those in positions of authority in the municipalities and in the province of Ontario. I think it might be well to appreciate the fact that there is serious urgency and a great deal of discontent in connection with this matter. Those who have the responsibility with respect to the solution should receive courtesy, whether the hon. minister thinks they deserve it or not.

There is a big trek into the city of Toronto of unemployed from outside, which throws a further burden on the city, and this is so with other municipalities. In 1930, when the Prime Minister made the statement in the House of Commons that he could see no urgency with respect to the unemployment situation in Toronto, there were thousands of citizens of that city starving, and the citizens of Toronto themselves were forced to come to the help of these destitute people. I wonder if the Minister of Labour sees no urgency in Toronto at the present time. Perhaps he will not go as far as to say "not a five cent piece for Tory Toronto."

Toronto has stood the burden of relief up to the very limit and far and away beyond what is the city's responsibility. There is an urgency to this matter. The municipality of the city of Toronto is unable to strike its tax rate at the present time. Relief has been so heavy, and the fact is that the municipalities are now so burdened by taxes that they are unable to contribute further. The city is faced with an increased allowance for relief. The allowance was based on the Campbell report made several years ago when prices were much lower, and is inadequate at the present time. The Minister of Labour is reported to have stated:

It is important to remember that the unemployment problem is gradually moving in the direction of solution. This statement is supported by preliminary figures contained in reports received from every province.

That may have been so some months ago, but the situation had materially altered in January and February of this year in the city of Toronto, and I imagine this is so in other municipalities. There was a very large increase in the number of those on relief in January of this year, and a still further increase in February. There were over 68,000 on relief in January. There were over 73,000 on relief in February. There are more now, and we know that there are a great many who have become unemployed but who have

[Mr. D. G. Ross.]

not yet gone on relief. A great many are of the opinion that there are as many people in the city of Toronto unemployed to-day as there were at this time last year, if not more. In any event, there are almost as many on relief as at this time last year. In my own riding of St. Paul's I can hear on every side nothing but conversations of this kind: "Bill has been laid off." "Tom's on short time." "I wonder how soon I will be cut down or laid off." "Do you think we are going to have another depression?" And yet the Minister of Labour is reported to have said that the unemployment problem is gradually moving in the direction of a solution.

The Minister of Labour is reported to have stated:

As to the question of the dominion government's contribution by grants in aid, three things should be borne in mind in considering this:

- (1) That Canada, being under a federal constitution, the dominion government is bound to exercise absolute impartiality in granting aid;
- (2) That aid granted must be paid by all Canadians;
- (3) That unemployment has decreased.

With respect to (3), in the last four months unemployment has not decreased in Toronto; it has increased, and the prospects are that it will continue to increase. With respect to (1) and (2), I quite agree with the minister, but this is not being carried out. Far from it; instead of exercising "absolute impartiality", the greatest partiality is being shown. The hon. minister is reported to have stated:

Now, as we near the end of the fiscal year, a demand comes from one province for an immediate increase in the grant in aid to that province. This demand is made even though the province in question is in excellent condition financially, and quite able to assist needy municipalities.

And again:

The grant to Ontario is fair and reasonable, having regard to the reduction of relief and the financial position of the province.

Most certainly the financial contribution from Ontario, in comparison with that of other provinces, is not being considered. Is that fair? Further on in his statement, the minister is reported as saying:

The fact that the condition due to drought in the west constitutes a national emergency was agreed to by all parties is apparently forgotten.

It has not been forgotten.

While there is a national emergency with respect to unemployment, as a result of drought in the west, there is undoubtedly a national emergency in connection with indus-