

## Unemployment Assistance

as it is traditionally understood, does not mean that under this act provision should be made for medical care. There is a proper way to deal with medical care. In any event, I do not think that we should assume that because the federal government gets into this particular field it should be obligated necessarily to get into other fields. There are fields for the federal government, for the provincial governments and for the municipal governments. In the absence of a hospital insurance proposal, I believe that is the proper field for the responsibility to lie where it does. In any event, it is not included in this act.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Mr. Chairman, in one breath the minister tells us that here he is exploring a field that had not even been anticipated in 1945, that he is doing far more than was asked of the federal government in 1945. In the next breath he says, "No; we are not going to countenance the payment of 50 per cent of the amounts that are ordinarily expended on persons who must apply for municipal relief". This is not a case of supplying hospital insurance or medical care to people who are normally employed. When you undertake to look after a person who is unable to provide for himself, you provide for him the things he needs, whether it be a doctor, medicine or whatever it may be.

The municipalities have always done that. They provide, for people who are unable to look after themselves, their total requirements. They provide them, it is true, at the basic level. That is what you get there, and you are always going to get the basic level. In other words, so long as the municipality and the province carry their share they are not going to splurge. In so far as moneys are concerned, the municipalities get their money only from real estate.

Now you are telling me in one breath that you have invaded a field that you never expected to invade and that you are doing far more than you ever expected to do and far more than the 1945 proposals set forth. On the other hand you say, that you are not going to allow this, you are not going to allow that, and you are not going to allow something else; and you differentiate again between the people who are unemployable and those who are employable but who, by reason of circumstances, are now unemployed.

I tell the minister to cut out this nonsense. I tell him either to lay no claim to these false virtues or else put in the act something which will actually give the provinces the thing which he claims he is giving here and which he is not giving.

**The Chairman:** Shall the clause carry?

**Mr. Pallett:** In support of what the hon. member for Hamilton West has stated, I may say that I took the figures the minister has given us this evening and by my computation, allowing 5 per cent deduction for the exceptions which are set forth in the act, it appears that he is giving Newfoundland 40 per cent of the cost of their relief; Saskatchewan about 15 per cent; Manitoba about 18 per cent; British Columbia about 28 per cent and Alberta nothing. I think this is something which has been rather clouded over today, but actually the contribution this act is going to make is not quite as much as the impression which has been given.

I think a comparison should be made of the figures on unemployment in Newfoundland. I believe such a comparison of the figures will show that something is strangely amiss. Either this government's statement about Newfoundland is wrong or else they are not fully participating in the benefits of this country along with the other provinces. I think the figures the minister has given us show that. I believe it is something the house should be considering very seriously, to see if any steps can be taken in that province to improve its position. I think the Newfoundland members as well as the minister from Newfoundland might well take some steps in this house to rectify that situation.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** I wonder if the minister would explain what is meant in section 8 (a) (vi) of the agreement, when it speaks of a supplemental allowance or cost of living bonus?

**Mr. Martin:** Yes. That simply means this. Those who are in receipt of old age assistance are excluded because they are already the recipients of provincial or federal grants; that is clear. For the portion of the supplementary payment that too is excluded in the cases I have mentioned, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, because those are supplementary payments across the board. However, in the case of Ontario the supplementary payment is of a different character. It is a payment in which the municipalities pay \$8 and the province \$12, and it is paid to a limited group of people, actually some 1,500.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Under the old age assistance?

**Mr. Martin:** Yes. Now, that supplementary payment in Ontario does not exclude them from this act for the reasons I have given, but it does exclude the supplementary payments in the other three provinces I mentioned. In those three provinces, in addition to the supplementary payments, the province might pay assistance over and above that, and that would bring the persons affected under this act.