

In all cases the increases in respect of the first three children are 4s., being the maximum permissible under the Unemployment Act, and the fourth and up to the seventh child 2s. in respect of each, which when added to the family allowance granted under the Family Allowances Act, maintains the same maximum for each child as is prescribed in the original Unemployment Act of 1930.

The following table shows the maximum relief assistance payable weekly under the existing Scheme No. 5 scale of relief :—

	Scale A.	Scale B.	Scale C.
	s.	s.	s.
Class A (single men)	17	14	12
Class B (married men with wife only) .. .	27	24	21
Class C (one child) .. .	31	28	25
Class D (two children) .. .	35	32	29
Class E (three children) .. .	39	36	33
Class F (four children) .. .	41	38	35
Class G (five children) .. .	43	40	37
Class H (six children) .. .	45	42	39
Class I (seven or more children) .. .	47	44	41

In determining the measure of relief assistance which might justifiably be extended under the Board's schemes consideration is given to the amount of private earnings or income received by the applicant. The Board's policy in this respect is that the ration of relief which may be granted to an eligible unemployed worker shall not be adversely affected by private earnings or income unless the total income into the household (from all sources, including relief, but subject to the following exceptions) exceeds a figure calculated according to the following scale :—

	Per Week.
	s.
Single applicant	40
Married applicant	25
Wife or housekeeper	20
Each <i>bona fide</i> dependant	4

Where the above scale is exceeded it is usual to reduce the ordinary ration of relief by the amount of the excess.

The following classes of income are entirely ignored in determining the measure of relief assistance to be granted :—

- Earnings of children under sixteen years of age.
- The first 17s. 6d. per week of any war disability pension.
- Family allowance.

SUSTENANCE PAYMENTS WITHOUT WORK.

For nearly three years after the constitution of the first Unemployment Board, applicants for relief from the Unemployment Fund were obliged to perform some kind of work in return for their relief pay. Towards the end of 1933 it became evident that local employing authorities, particularly in the main urban areas where over 50 per cent. of relief workers on a rationed basis are domiciled, were reaching the end of their resources both from a financial point of view in meeting supervision and other costs and by reason of difficulty in finding suitable work.

One of the main difficulties arose in the continued provision of suitable light work for those of the unemployed who were unfit for heavy manual labour. Many local bodies also were faced with the position that all their useful works of a nature applicable to the absorption of relief labour under the Board's rules were rapidly nearing completion. From this state of affairs it was only a short step to the employment of relief workers on essential jobs in the nature of ordinary maintenance. There was only one alternative, and, in order to meet the position which arose, the Board was forced to review its stated policy that sustenance without work would not be granted.

For obvious reasons, sustenance payments could not be granted on the same scale as relief pay, and those workers whom it was impossible to place on approved relief works were therefore granted sustenance in proportion to the ration of relief they would have been eligible for, but on a slightly lower scale. Every effort was made to rotate work and sustenance so that the men should not be penalized by circumstances over which they had no control. In other words, the available work was distributed as evenly as possible amongst the eligible and most deserving applicants for relief.

Later on it became evident that the position was still not being met satisfactorily, mainly because of the high proportion of men who were not fitted by age, physique, or previous experience for the class of work offering.