

Mr. Ashbourne I can't answer offhand how many there are.

Mr. Crummey Two.

Mr. Smallwood I am not going to delay you at all, but a minute ago Mr. Jones referred to that amount of \$1.1 million as being dole. That's not quite the case. It is \$1.1 million for this year, but it is not all able-bodied relief or dole; it is for the sick poor, for widows, children, for special food orders, extra nourishment that is, and coal and clothing. That \$1.1 million is for this year to the end of March. Now if you take the report and add up the different things under the different headings it is astonishing, and I am sure if Major Cashin has not already done it he will be astonished when he sees what the total comes to — \$1.1 million for those items I have just mentioned. Widows and orphans, including board and lodging, is another \$450,000; old age pensions \$250,000; grants to orphanages \$40,000 odd; aged and infirm \$78,000 — that's a total of \$2 million this very year for relief of one kind and another — if you can call old age pensions relief, and perhaps you should not, but it is in that general classification — \$2 million a year. Now in the old days the sick poor and widows and children of widows and special food orders, coal and clothing, that was all called dole. You take the figures today and you can find there are only 300-400 people on the dole. That seems to compare very well with six or eight years ago, but the reason is this, that they have changed the system. What is now called dole is only able-bodied relief, but in the old days up to the war everything was called dole, and if you included everything today in the year that ended yesterday the government spent \$2 million on public relief. It is an astonishing figure.

Mr. Fudge I have had some experience in getting applications forwarded to the Department of Public Health and Welfare, especially with the relieving officer. As I see it this widow that was referred to here is entitled to the \$18 per quarter, provided that she is not one that in the opinion of the relieving officer can support herself. I remember a case or two where the widow has been living with the son, and the son has a large family, and in the opinion of the relieving officer the son could very well look after the mother as well as his wife and children, and the OK from the relieving officer did not go on the form. If

that's the principle of the Department of Public Health and Welfare, that this poor old soul must go over with the son, and he has to support his mother along with his family, I am wondering if that principle should not apply even to the official of the department. If I am correctly informed there are officials of this department who have been recommended for a pension. I wonder whether any investigation was made as to whether any of the sons of these officials are able to look after them, and therefore why the pension?

Mr. Bailey I don't know if Mr. Smallwood meant that old age pensions etc. should be called dole. I think it is to our discredit that the country is in such a shape as it is, and I don't believe it should go down as such, or that the country should get the impression that it is. If a man gets sick the government has a fund for that, which is called social security. Dole should be able-bodied relief and nothing else — for the man who can work, but can't get work to do.

Mr. Smallwood I did not call the old age pension dole, I said that generally under the heading of relief we might include old age pensions. I expressed some doubt as to whether old age pensions could even be included under relief, I was not even talking of dole at that moment. I think that you can almost measure the civilisation of a country by the extent to which that country looks after its wornout toilers. They say you can measure the standards of a country by the way in which we bury our dead, but you can certainly measure it by the way in which the wornout toilers are treated.

Mr. Bailey Well, we have called relief dole in the past, and dole relief, but I would like to see in this the amount that the people received who would have worked, but could not on account of sickness, and I would like to see it classified as social security.

Mr. Ashbourne Referring to that matter brought up by Mr. Fudge, was that widow you mentioned the widow of an old age pensioner? I can't understand how they can grant a man and his wife a pension, and then take away the pension from the wife after the man who was her sole support was taken away. I think that calls for special investigation with the department.

Mr. Starkes I think his wife was living, but instead of getting \$30 a quarter he was only