

*Unemployment Assistance*

**Mrs. Fairclough:** In other words, anything in which the federal government does not participate.

**Mr. Martin:** Or the provinces; it is under the old age assistance act.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** You say if it is directly a provincial payment it can be included?

**Mr. Martin:** If it is a public assistance payment over and above the old age assistance.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Anything in which the federal government assistance is excluded.

**Mr. Carter:** We in Newfoundland are very happy to have this legislation, even if the people do not want it in Ontario. Earlier this afternoon the hon. member for Oxford asked a question which was intended to point out that the percentage of the total cost under this legislation that would be borne by the federal government would be, in many cases, less than 50 per cent. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is obvious.

Under the formula set forth in the legislation the percentage cost must vary from zero up to 49.9 per cent. If one approaches this legislation from the viewpoint of sharing the percentage cost, in my opinion one is tending to obscure its true value. When the percentage cost borne by the federal government is zero that means we are having prosperity and there is no burden to carry above the .45 per cent. For my part, I hope the federal share under this legislation will always be zero, because that means we will always be having the same high level of prosperity we are enjoying at the present time. The present government is doing what it can to maintain this prosperity. It is trying to steer a course between recession on the one hand and inflation on the other. But hon. members must remember that there are certain things outside of the control of even this government.

**Mr. Churchill:** Name one.

**Mr. Carter:** There are conditions in the outside world which can adversely affect the economy of this country over which we have no control whatever. We do not pretend to be able to control the weather. Hon. members can turn their minds back 18 months and they will recall that we were faced with a paradoxical situation in which unemployment figures soared to a record level at the very time the country in general was enjoying unprecedented prosperity. At that time in my own province of Newfoundland the number of people receiving relief rose from .6 per cent of the population in September,

[Mr. Martin.]

1954, to 4.4 per cent in March, 1955. During that same period in my own riding of Burin-Burgeo the number of people receiving relief rose from 1.8 per cent of the population in September, 1954, to 9.63 per cent in March, 1955. It is at a time like that when the true benefit of this legislation can be appreciated. It provides assistance at a time when assistance is needed most.

Some hon. members have indicated that the federal government should make itself responsible for 100 per cent of the cost of the unemployed employables. I believe that stand was taken by Ontario when these things were considered at the provincial conference. I do not share that view. In the first place, to do this you must separate the unemployed employables from the people who cannot be employed because of their physical condition. One of the things about this legislation which appeals to me very much is the fact that it wipes out that distinction completely and for all time; I think that is as it should be.

Another reason that I do not agree with the government taking 100 per cent responsibility is that I do not think it is in the national interest. Since I came to this parliament in 1949 we have passed numerous laws in which we have removed responsibility from individuals, organizations or some levels of government and placed it on the federal government.

In Canada we are building a nation. We are developing a Canadian way of life. I think we are developing patterns of government that are distinctly Canadian. If we are to do a good job and make Canada a good nation the way to do it is not to remove responsibility from the places where it belongs. The proper way to do it, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is to acknowledge a joint responsibility and a joint sharing of the burden, and that is what this legislation does.

**Mr. Trainor:** Also a joint sharing of the tax revenue; don't forget that.

**Mr. McIlraith:** In Manitoba?

**Mr. Carter:** When the great province of Ontario puts the same tax on its gasoline as the province of Newfoundland has to, then the province of Ontario will have plenty of money to pay the .45 per cent and the rest of the formula required in this legislation.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** On a question of privilege, the hon. member who has just taken his seat kept referring in his remarks, I believe on two or three occasions, to the member for Oxford. Perhaps he should get his members sorted out, because I have made no comment on this bill so far.