

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that at the resolution stage of the bill, and later in the standing committee, we also discussed this matter of those persons who are taken ill subsequent to lay-off and before they qualify for benefit, or sometimes before they have an opportunity to make application for benefit. This is a matter that could very well be taken care of by regulation. I urge the minister, and through him the commissioners, to take this into consideration, particularly in cases where it can be established that the claimant has actually been released from employment by reason of lack of work, or for any of the other reasons which would ordinarily qualify him for receipt of benefits.

I trust the minister will take them into consideration, and that these people—the cases are few but none the less distressing—will not be deprived of benefit by reason of illness, accident, or quarantine which occurs subsequent to the time of their lay-off.

**Mr. Gregg:** All I can say now with regard to what both speakers have just said is to indicate that the points they have made will be taken into consideration pending further amendments to the act. I cannot extend any hope that we may make any change in either case at the present time.

**Mr. Barnett:** I did not quite catch all the minister's remarks. If I do not interpret what he said correctly I hope he will put me right. I understood him to say that he would not agree to any change in connection with the matters we have been discussing during consideration of this bill. I think I heard that part of his remarks correctly. However, the other part which I did not quite understand was how far he went in indicating that this matter is to be given serious study and consideration.

At one point in the proceedings of the committee, when the matter was under discussion, I showed how easily I felt the extension of coverage for unemployment through illness could be tied in with the present unemployment insurance plan, because that seemed to be the trend along which such coverage was developing in many industries across the country, where the method of paying the premium in many plants is that the employees contribute half the cost and the employers contribute the other half. The premiums are collected by payroll deductions. In many instances the benefits payable roughly approximate the benefits currently being paid under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I feel that because of that development, which certainly in the area of the country with which I am most familiar is becoming so

[Mr. Knowles.]

widespread as to be nearly universal in the major industries at least, continuing study and attention should be given to developing and broadening it. I think it is a most inefficient system to have one special deduction for unemployment insurance through loss of work and another scheme for unemployment insurance because of illness. Apart from anything else, it is costing the working people and the employers a good deal more than would be the case if such an arrangement were tied in with a national scheme. Even if it were to be taken into consideration only from the point of view of efficiency and economy it seems to me that would be a most logical approach to take at this time.

I hope I understood the minister to indicate to the committee that this matter is going to receive continuous and certain study, with a view to bringing in, in the not too distant future, provision for coverage such as has been suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

**Mr. Gregg:** Mr. Chairman, I do not want it to appear that I gave a more buoyant reply than I actually did. I did state—this applies to the matters referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Hamilton West—that these matters would be studied most carefully pending any further amendments to the act at a coming session.

Clause agreed to.

On clause 67—*Regulations.*

**Mrs. Fairclough:** Mr. Chairman, I think it is probably apparent by now that two things have happened. One, I am rapidly losing my voice and two, I am really serious about clause (c) (iv) of subsection 1. I think I have just enough voice left to move one more amendment. Not to belabour the point, having already covered the reasons why I think I should move this amendment, I now move:

That section (c) (iv) of subclause (1) of clause 67 be deleted.

**The Deputy Chairman:** It might be noted that the words that would be deleted are "who are married women".

**Mr. Gillis:** Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat what I said a short time ago. I think I have argued about this regulation as much as anyone in the house. During the course of our discussions in the committee I felt that a slight change in the regulations would eliminate much of the difficulty of administration and many repercussions with respect to the woman who leaves employment after marrying.