

they do not re-enlist. The number of these people is quite considerable and I think they need some protection such as unemployment insurance or something else. I am not aware of the actual number of discharges from the armed forces last year—in 1954—but I think it was something like 10,000 or 15,000.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: It was about 13,000, I think.

Mr. HARKNESS: —and that was the year after which all the people who specially enlisted for Korea either re-enlisted or got out. That was a year in which the Korean situation did not apply at all.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it did apply, Mr. Harkness, because it was a year when some of the special force who had transferred to the regular force saw the termination of their three-year period of enlistment in the regular force.

Mr. HARKNESS: There must have been few of those because the regular force people joined up in 1950. In any event, many of them were people who had not joined up for the Korean force but for the first term of service and they were discharged. Therefore, we have a very considerable number who are discharged from the armed forces every year—the minister indicated about 13,000 out of a total of about 100,000 all told. You see, that is a high percentage, and it seems to me under those circumstances that the people who serve for three years or less should be protected. I am inclined to agree with the proposal I understood Mr. Gillis to put forward that people should be protected by unemployment insurance during their first three years of service. Once they have joined up for a second or a third term then it could be removed if it is known that they intend to make the army their career and they do not need the unemployment insurance. The people who are serving their first term do need it, I think, and it seems to me that it would be proper to work something out to protect them.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Mind you, I am not at all adverse to the suggested amendment to Bill 278, but I am very strongly of the opinion which was expressed by Mr. Harkness. I know that in the bank where I have my overdraft, they always tell me that we are a bunch of so-and-so's because they have to contribute to unemployment insurance. I do not make this motion in order to kill the situation at all, which is generally the term that is applied when you move that a bill or an amendment be given a six-month hoist. It seems to me, however, that what Mr. Quelch has said is applicable in many cases across Canada. As members of the House we all realize that it is pretty tough on occasions to impose contributions on either civilians or servicemen without having some idea as to how that imposition is going to be accepted by those who have to pay the shot. Surely through the various branches of the services some idea could be ascertained before this time next year as to how the servicemen feel with respect to this measure.

What my good friend Mr. Harkness said is true to an extent. We will say, for instance, about 10 per cent of the armed forces are discharged for various reasons before the expiry of their three-year period.

Mr. HARKNESS: Most of them just do not re-enlist after the three-year period.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Yes, so I would move, Mr. Chairman, particularly in the light of Mr. Anderson's statement that Bill 278 is a good bill, and that this objection is, at the moment, not one that we can be too dogmatic about; I would suggest, sir, or rather I move—will you second it Mr. Quelch?—that the amendment as suggested concerning unemployment insurance for the armed forces be given a six-month hoist.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not certain what you mean, Mr. MacDougall. Are you suggesting that the bill itself be given a six-month hoist?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: No, just the amendment suggested by Mr. Anderson.