

great difficulties, but the cooperation and the temper of the members of the committee was of the very best throughout. The Minister of Labour, who was made chairman, succeeded in the difficult task of getting the bill through the committee in record time without having once, as far as I can recollect, asked a member to shorten his remarks or unduly hurrying the committee's work. This is something of an achievement.

I think also that a word should be said for the members of the Department of Labour who were present at the committee meetings to inform its members. I wish to refer particularly to Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Stangroom, who I believe should be on the floor here when we deal with the various sections of the bill. I am sure that their assistance will be as much appreciated by the members of this committee of the whole as it was by the special committee.

It is of course regrettable that the bill was not introduced earlier in the session, and it is possible that if it had been, more study could have been given to it and more amendments proposed. But although it is possible it seems to be doubtful that such would have been the case. In saying this I am not condoning the bringing down of the bill at this late time.

Mr. MacNICOL: Better late than never.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think all the members of the committee will agree with me when I say that I believe the utmost care has been given to the drafting of the bill. As hon. members are aware, the bill with a few alterations is the same as the 1935 act. But in addition to following the 1935 Canadian act the draughting officials gave close attention to the form and administration of the unemployment insurance act of Great Britain, and the long experience in administering that act, since 1911, must be taken into consideration by members of this committee in dealing with the bill.

I think I am also correct in saying that the committee refrained from making amendments to the bill, amendments which I believe appeared reasonable to a majority of the committee, for three reasons: First, the committee was anxious not to do anything which might delay the passing of the bill. Second, the committee was aware that important additions to the employments included in the bill, or important deductions from the employments covered by the bill, would upset the actuarial calculations on which the contributions and benefits are computed. Undoubtedly this would lead to some delay and for that reason, and in my opinion very properly, the committee refrained from interfering with

the bill to any great extent. Third, the committee was impressed with a realization of the magnitude of the task of building up the organization necessary for the administration of the act. I doubt if anyone, except those who have been closely associated with the drafting of the bill, realizes the extent of that organization and the great care with which it will have to be created. As a consequence the committee felt that it should not impose too great a burden on the commission at a time when it would be engaged in very, very difficult work. I think that sums up the spirit in which the committee dealt with this measure. In any case, that was the way it appeared to me.

A number of organizations appeared before the committee, organizations which can be classed largely in two categories; that is, employers' organizations and workers' organizations. The employers' organizations, the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, asked for postponement of the bill to a more opportune time, and also for investigation or study of some other nebulous schemes they had in mind. Personally I was not impressed with their arguments. I agreed with the representative of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada when he said that he never knew of an opportune time to bring in social legislation, so far as these organizations were concerned.

We had the benefit of the independent opinion of Mr. Wolfenden, an actuary of some note. Again I must say that personally I was not impressed with Mr. Wolfenden's evidence. It seemed to me that his submissions were too extreme, and extreme statements are always suspect. I should like to quote very briefly from what he had to say, first from page 216 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence before the committee:

On this test, which I believe to be a fair and professionally acceptable appraisal of the problem, it is my conviction that the scheme set out in bill 98 is, at the present time, "actuarially indeterminate".

Then he goes on to give his reasons for that statement:

In this case—in the year 1940, in respect of any estimate of future unemployment—it is, it seems to me, wholly impossible to formulate methods of calculation "with reasonable certainty, and with adequate margins of safety." It is quite impossible to assume with any reasonable certainty what the basic rate of unemployment, on which all the calculations must be based, is likely to be.

If at this time it is impossible to base our calculations on what the unemployment will be for a number of years following 1940 then the inference is that we should not go on