

A comparison of the totals on "relief" at the nearest date to the end of each quarter as shown in that table, with the corresponding dates back to June, 1931, reveals the following position :—

Total Numbers either wholly or partly a Charge on Unemployment Fund.

End of Quarter.	1931.	1932.	1933.	Annual Increase.	
				1931-32.	1932-33.
March	47,520	61,070	..	13,550
June	44,400	61,200	69,520	16,800	8,320
September	46,990	67,110	75,130	20,120	8,020
December	47,285	64,080	..	16,795	..

In spite of the continued increase in the numbers dependent on the fund for relief, there is cause for satisfaction in the fact that 1933 figures show a much smaller rise over 1932 as compared with the increase between 1931 and 1932. Taking the June quarter figures, we find the 1931-32 increase to be 16,800 as against 8,320 for 1932-33. On a September quarter comparison, the corresponding increases are 20,120 and 8,020 respectively.

The percentage increases for these periods in respect of recipients of assistance from the Unemployment Fund are as follows :—

End of	1931-32.	1932-33.
Per Cent.	Per Cent.	
June quarter	37·8	13·6
September quarter	42·8	12·0

These figures, taken in conjunction with fluctuations in weekly registrations, indicate that the upward swing in numbers of workless experienced during the last three years is apparently arrested.

Mention was made in the Board's previous report of the number of "unemployables" and other men included in registrations of unemployed, but not considered to be eligible for relief from the Unemployment Fund.

A table dissecting the registrations at the end of each four-weekly period according to whether or not the men concerned received any relief under Scheme No. 5 during the period will be found in the Appendix. There is always a proportion of *registered* unemployed not engaged on relief work, of which a considerable number represents new registrations or re-registrations. Men excluded from awards of relief owing to doubtful eligibility include those who might have received some assistance from the Fund if sufficient finance had been available, but whose relative degree of necessity was hardly sufficient to warrant their participation in relief under prevailing conditions.

The proportion under this heading during the last twelve months is not so high as during the previous year. A possible interpretation of this feature is that more applicants for work participated in relief under Scheme No. 5. Against this explanation is the fact that the proportion of definitely ineligible men has also dropped considerably, indicating that careful check on the eligibility of applicants has discouraged increasing numbers of men from keeping their registrations alive in the hope of participating in relief benefits to which they have no legitimate claim.

Finally, it should be explained that since September, 1932, the returns of those who are a charge on the Unemployment Fund have been compiled once every four weeks instead of every calendar month, as previously.

FARM SUBSIDY SCHEMES.

Expenditure by the Board under Scheme No. 4A for the financial year ended 31st March, 1933, totalled £217,047. The number of men working on farms on a subsidized basis through the scheme at the end of each four weeks during the period under review is shown in Table II in the Appendix. The average number working throughout the twelve months ended 30th September, 1933, was approximately 5,200.

Under the Farm Camp Scheme small camps are set up on farmers' properties, and the labour utilized for developmental work only. Each camp absorbs a minimum of four single men, the remaining conditions of employment being similar to those laid down under the rules of Scheme No. 4A. At the end of September, 1933, some 2,700 men had been given employment under the Farm Camp Scheme, and there were 665 men in farm camps on the 30th September, 1933.

As a result of the Board's decision in July, 1932, to raise the subsidy basis of Scheme No. 4B to 50 per cent. of the contract price, applications have increased during the year ended 30th September, 1933, by 300 per cent. over the previous year.

At the end of September, 1933, there were 1,601 contracts in force, providing for the employment of 4,703 men under Scheme No. 4B, while 2,835 contracts had been completed by that date. Some 5,822 men had been paid off as a result of completed contracts, so that altogether a total of 10,525 men had been placed under Scheme No. 4B at an estimated cost in subsidies of £104,870. From the