

Supply—Labour

even though there may still be no employment for him. I think that we have covered the ground in previous discussions of this matter. We have made it clear that although some of us want over-all social security, including health insurance, that is not what we are talking about at this particular time. At this time we are simply asking for a change either in the act or in the regulations, wherever it is necessary, to ensure to the worker who has qualified for benefits and is drawing them that he will continue to draw them even though he takes sick afterwards, particularly when there is no employment for him. In my view that last qualification should not be necessary. I mention it because when a worker has his benefits cut off that often happens to be the situation, namely, that the unemployment insurance office is still unable to supply him with work because he has taken sick, but when his wife goes down to collect the insurance she is told that her husband can no longer draw the benefits. That is the way it happens many times.

Perhaps as a result of this having been raised on the floor of the house a number of times during the past few years and also because it has been discussed in the various unemployment insurance advisory committees across the country, it has been discussed by the top level unemployment insurance advisory committee in Ottawa. My information in that connection grows out of a number of questions I put on the order paper and the answers given to them.

As a result of learning that the unemployment insurance advisory committee did give consideration to it and did refer the question to Mr. A. D. Watson, an actuarial adviser in the department of insurance, I moved a motion for production of papers, calling for the tabling of the report that Mr. Watson had made to the unemployment insurance advisory committee. That report may be found in sessional paper 61D, tabled on Friday, November 18, 1949. I had hoped that it would be a report dealing with this specific and rather restricted question which we have discussed so often on the floor of the house. It turns out, however, that Mr. Watson went considerably afield from that restricted problem and dealt with the whole question of sickness insurance. In my opinion that memorandum is not particularly helpful on the broad question of sickness insurance. In a footnote on page 1 of the memorandum to the committee, which is now sessional paper 61D, Mr. Watson makes his only reference to the particular question in hand, and this is what he says:

The idea of limiting sickness benefit to periods of sickness falling within periods of unemployment is not herein examined, for such a provision would

inevitably lead to serious anomalies and dissatisfaction and at the same time would open wide the door to fraud on the fund, mainly through arranging periods of unemployment so as to take in periods of actual or anticipated sickness.

I still feel that in asking the minister to consider this change we have a valid and strong case. I urge him to give this matter serious and favourable consideration. If the unemployment insurance advisory committee is to consider this matter and make recommendations to the minister I ask that they get some other advice because the footnote I have just quoted indicates a complete lack of understanding of the problem. I submit that the committee went to the wrong place when they got that advice. I urge the minister and his committee to get the best possible advice.

I am sure that hon. members who have thought about the kind of circumstance I have described will agree with me that when a worker becomes unemployed and qualifies for unemployment insurance, if he becomes sick while unemployed, his benefits should not be cut off, particularly, as is so often the case, when the unemployment insurance office has no employment for him.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Fournier (Hull): With unanimous consent, I would move the adjournment of the house until eleven o'clock on Monday. Before announcing the business for Monday I would say that the two resolutions on the order paper in the name of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Fisheries will not be discussed at this session. The first item of business on Monday will be the private bill in the name of the hon. member for Kamloops concerning crime comics. Then there is the motion in the name of the Minister of Mines and Resources which I am told is only a matter of formality; then Bill No. 220, to amend the Government Employees Compensation Act, 1947. This is only a small bill for the determination of compensation for injuries to government employees in Prince Edward Island. Then Bill No. 149, respecting bankruptcy; then Bill No. 216, to encourage the construction and conversion of vessels in Canada; then Bill No. 176, to amend the Income Tax Act and the Income War Tax Act. We expect that there will be a bill to amend the Customs Tariff Act introduced on Monday, but this has only one or two sections. As far as I know that will complete the program of legislation for the session. If we get through