

*Unemployment Assistance*

**Mr. Martin:** I shall be very happy to give them, because I think it is very valuable information.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** As a matter of fact the Ontario figure is 23,323 for June and the hard core is 27,000, which is quite a different picture. Four thousand are not even in there.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** That shows how lucky you are in Ontario.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** That is all right.

**Mr. Martin:** In June in Prince Edward Island the .45 figure would be 486 and the actual number is 647 so we would be paying on 247 in that province. In Manitoba the hard core figure is 3,820 and the total is 6,943. In the case of British Columbia the hard core figure—this is for June—is 5,872 and the total is 17,773. In other words we would be paying a share, in the case of British Columbia, on about 14,000.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Twelve thousand.

**Mr. Martin:** Excuse me. I quoted the wrong one. British Columbia, 5,872; about 12,000. In the case of Alberta the hard core figure is 4,797 and as of July of 1954, 5,032.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Just a minute. Some of these figures are for 1955 and some are for 1954.

**Mr. Martin:** I am quoting the latest figures we have. The one I am giving you now is for 1954.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** That is 4,797?

**Mr. Martin:** It is 4,797.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** What is the other figure?

**Mr. Martin:** It is 5,032.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** You have given us a few odd provinces.

**Mr. Martin:** I have given you British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I have given you Prince Edward Island and I have given you Newfoundland.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Yes.

**Mr. Martin:** The other provinces are Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Of those provinces, the only one with which we have an agreement is New Brunswick. We have not yet received the reimbursement claim from New Brunswick, and obviously we have not had it from the other three provinces with which as yet we have no agreement.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Mr. Chairman, this just shows you how these figures get twisted around. Take for instance the province of Newfoundland. There are about  $7\frac{1}{2}$  or 8 times

[Mr. Martin.]

as many obviously on assistance as in the hard core who would come under this .45. In Prince Edward Island there are a matter of 15 per cent more than .45. Then in the case of Manitoba you have about 60 per cent more. In British Columbia you have three times as many. In Alberta you have almost even—stephen. But in Ontario—and the minister says he has not the figures for Ontario or any of these other provinces—according to the figures the minister gave us earlier the hard core would be 27,000, of whom the number receiving assistance was 23,323, or about 90 per cent. Obviously the figures are entirely different in these various provinces. That fact certainly points up the reason some provinces wish to participate in this scheme and others do not.

**Mr. Martin:** I am sure my hon. friend will agree that none of us wants to see these figures—I know my hon. friend would be the first to join with me in this—any higher.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** No.

**Mr. Martin:** We are fortunate that in Ontario they are not higher. That is not to be complained about. Surely that is a satisfactory situation. But the fact is that under this bill we are getting authority to share with the provinces in the cost for a substantial number of people, including a group beyond the threshold for whom it was never recommended or suggested that there should be any provision made by the federal government. That is the advantage of this act, and I think it is a very big one.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Mr. Chairman, we come right back again to the minister's pious hopes or expostulations of the pre-dinner hour. They just do not hold water. I come back to this clause which I started to talk about, clause 4 (2) (d) of the act. I asked the minister what happened to the medical costs, hospital costs and so on which have been incurred on behalf of these people, and he told me they were not payable under this act.

**Mr. Martin:** That is right. I forgot that. I agree with that. My hon. friend did raise that matter. This is not a health insurance measure. It is a public assistance measure. My hon. friend will remember, because of her municipal experience, that under the unemployment relief and assistance act that came into being some time between 1930 and 1935 and was carried on until 1941, I believe, provision was not made for medical care. It was made for food, clothing and shelter, just as is done in this measure. The proper place to deal with medical care and expenses is under a health insurance measure.

The fact that the federal government is engaging itself to share in public assistance,