

They had their manifesto in Regina in 1932 and it is still a manifesto in the blueprint stage.

Mrs. STRUM: How can we be blamed for not carrying it out when we have not been the government?

Mr. MITCHELL: My hon. friends will have to do what every political party has had to do, convince the people and the nation that they are on the right track.

Mrs. STRUM: We are.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is just as simple as the fact that the sun will rise tomorrow morning. I am not saying this in a critical sense; it is just a passing observation.

Mr. FRASER: Just in a kindly way.

Mr. MITCHELL: I thought I would just make these one or two observations because we have heard so much about 1919. Probably we shall hear a good deal about 1932.

Mr. CROLL: May we get back to 1948? I am rising to support the statement made in the house by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and the hon. member for Vancouver North with reference to what I think is an unreasonable interpretation of the regulations. The act never contemplated that a man must go to the office in order to draw his unemployment insurance; that is simply an administrative regulation. It appears to me that to deprive a man, who is unable to go to the office because of illness, of his unemployment insurance benefits, is to increase the fund by a method almost tantamount to chiseling.

The minister should take action immediately with respect to this sort of thing. Many cases have been brought to my attention which have been handled in the way indicated in this house. I repeat that it was never intended that the act should be carried out in that way. I know it is easy from the point of view of administration, but on the other hand the act does not depend for its improvement on that sort of administration. It is a good act and, because it is, there is no purpose or reason why it should in a small way incur the anger of people and bring upon itself a certain amount of discredit. This ought to be corrected at once.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should like to say a further word with respect to one other matter the minister was good enough to comment on. I was glad to hear him say that he had an open mind with regard to this question of having three umpires instead of one. I admit

that the points he made have some validity, but I know also that in trade union circles there is a strong feeling about this matter. The minister knows that when the Unemployment Insurance Act is discussed in trade union circles it is discussed among its friends.

I am going to give the minister an example of the kind of thing that bothers these friends of the Unemployment Insurance Act. I ask the minister not to get warm under the collar because I refer to this kind of thing. I do not intend to imply that there is any miscarriage of justice or anything of that kind.

According to information put out by the unemployment insurance commission, a certain number of appeals were made to the umpire during the period April 1, 1947, to October 31, 1947. This is the disposition of the appeals dealt with during that period. Of the appeals made to the umpire by the claimants, namely by the persons who were trying to secure their unemployment insurance benefits, two were upheld and thirty-six were denied. On the other hand, in the case of appeals taken to the umpire by the insurance officer, thirty-six were upheld and only eight were denied. I ask the minister not to get hot under the collar because I mention that. I am not trying to make it out as a case of the miscarriage of British justice. I know the minister may say something about the fact that when an insurance officer takes a case to the umpire he is a little better acquainted with the facts, perhaps; but, even after you introduce all these extenuating circumstances, the fact is that that sort of result adds to the feeling of the trade unionists, who are friends of this act, that it would be much better to have these decisions made not by one umpire, but by a board which might consist of at least three umpires.

This is only one of the arguments, but for the others I refer the minister to the brief which I have already quoted from tonight, which I am sure has been submitted to him by the trades and labour council of my own city. I just want to say I am glad that he indicated he has an open mind on this question, and I hope he will pursue the matter and see whether this is not a change which ought to be made.

Mr. SHAW: I have one question. There has come to my notice a number of cases where so-called suitable employment could not be found or where the applicant who was residing in a small hamlet where there was no employment, was ordered to move to take a job in some other place. That has happened in a number of cases, even though the individual may own his home and may have