

*Unemployment Relief*

Mr. NICHOLSON: At page 14 of the report I see an item, No. 20, with reference to the reestablishment of settlers, \$250,000.

Mr. GARDINER: That does not include northern settlement work, or it may have included such work prior to four years ago when it was changed from the Department of Labour to the Department of Agriculture; or if it is there, it is merely an account of the work in order to make the report complete on assistance.

Mr. NICHOLSON: It is for the last year.

Mr. GARDINER: This bill would not have anything to do with the northern settlement end of it.

There is another point. Much of the discussion that has taken place has had to do with an entirely different expenditure, one not under this measure or under the northern settlement plan. In the years when the drought was bad there was no legislation to deal with it, and what the government did under those circumstances, while Mr. Bennett was in power, and under this government as well, was this: When those conditions arose in the middle of the summer and there was no legislation on the statute books, the money was produced by warrant, and we had to come into this house session after session and vote millions that may not be in these records at all. If they are in the records, they are not related to the bill.

When you say Saskatchewan borrowed so much money and got so much more under this legislation, you may not have all the figures. Very substantial amounts of money have been spent in Saskatchewan under warrants which have been issued, and the greater part of that money has been spent through the Department of Agriculture and not through the Department of Labour. There was something over \$20,000,000 in 1937-38 spent through the Department of Agriculture under these warrants, because of the fact that we had drought on which we had not counted when parliament was in session.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And for which there was no financial provision.

Mr. GARDINER: That is correct. That was reported at the next session of parliament; the house agreed that the money should have been spent, and passed on to another year. Many of these matters are dealt with, not through this legislation but in other ways.

I should like to say a word with regard to one other matter which has come up time after time in these discussions. It was brought

[Mr. Gardiner.]

to my mind by the newspaper clipping, I think it was, read by the hon. member for Mackenzie a few moments ago, stating that somebody had notified some individual that after August they could not depend upon further relief allowances.

Mr. NICHOLSON: This notice was sent out with the June relief order, from the northern areas branch.

Mr. GARDINER: I will explain that. I think a notice which covers three months is a fairly long notice. These notices say that after August there may be no relief issued. This is not something happening for the first time this year. I understand the matter fully; I have dealt with it for many years, both here and in the province. No government, either federal, provincial or municipal, intends to pay relief one day longer than it must.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is right.

Mr. GARDINER: I think that is proper. They intend to pay relief just as long as it is a necessity in order to assist people.

Now may I say this. No matter what our wishes or feelings may be, there is no government, municipal, provincial or dominion, whatever may be its name, that is going to do for individuals what those individuals would like to do and would do for themselves if conditions were such that they could look after themselves without assistance from the government. No government is ever going to be able to satisfy all the people to whom they must give assistance. I do not think it makes any difference what form of government you have, or under what name the government operates; that will be the situation. People will never get from a government what they really require in order to live as we all believe people should be able to live. It has always been found difficult to bring about that condition with government assistance, and I think that will always be the case.

Having said that, I should like to mention how the system has operated. This has been stated a number of times from the opposite point of view. We have said that the municipality has the first responsibility, the province the next and the dominion the next; and we say that when the municipality cannot meet the situation, it is up to the province or the dominion, or all three combined. Look at it in this way. The municipality is the first authority upon which is placed the responsibility of saying whether or not there is going to be any further relief. For that very