

should I contribute?" Like Mr. Gillis, I feel that as long as they are in favour of it, let them have it, but I would ask that a very careful study be made of what the actual situation is.

Mr. GILLIS: If you are going to make a deduction from someone's pay envelope, you should be pretty sure he is agreeable to it. In respect to his pay the soldier is not exactly in the same position as a worker in industry. To start with he has his assignment of pay to his wife, which is quite substantial. Also, he has a 5 per cent to 6 per cent deduction for superannuation purposes, and if he is going in the regular forces and intends to make that his permanent employment, another deduction is made which is merely a contribution to the fund. I think he is likely to object to this unless he has been consulted. Most of the veterans I meet today with whom I discuss the question of separated family allowance, protest the amount they have to assign their families. As far as I am concerned, as I see the Legion's recommendation, it is a good thing for the fund. I also agree with him that no one likes to pay if he feels he has no chance of benefiting by it.

I think if you were to take a poll among the railroaders you would find that they resent paying unemployment insurance, because they say, "We will never be unemployable." In relation to the members of the services, I think if you cut them off at three years and protect them for a three-year period, that would be the thing to start with. And then if the other thing which Mr. Anderson anticipates comes up, it could be changed. I think that if you want to get your foot in we should have a cut-off date after three years.

Mr. QUELCH: It was mentioned that if you have a cut-off date in July, it would be discrimination against the soldier who has to contribute and he would undoubtedly feel that he was being discriminated against. The one who wants to contribute and is not allowed to do so, would also feel that he is being discriminated against, and in that event all the soldiers would feel they are being discriminated against. I feel that until there is a definite opinion expressed by the soldiers themselves we should continue the contributions as they are at the present time, and if a growing volume of protests start to come in—and the army is never hesitant in beefing if they feel strongly about a subject—then that would be the time to cut off the unemployment insurance.

An Hon. MEMBER: What is the contribution at the present time?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no contribution made by the personnel. The Department of Veterans Affairs pays into the fund an amount which constitutes both the employers' and the employees' contribution by making a contribution of 96 cents a week for each man as he is being discharged. The contribution is made for the men being discharged.

An Hon. MEMBER: At the time of discharge?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

An Hon. MEMBER: In other words, what has been said here about contributions from the armed services personnel does not apply?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it would not.

Mr. GILLIS: I did not say he contributed to this fund. It is to the superannuation fund, which is a different thing altogether.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): Has the Legion any objection to Bill 278 in its present form?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, except that we would like to see these people protected in some way—again I am referring to people who are likely to be released for medical reasons and so on. We certainly have had no serious objection raised by anyone to any of the features of the bill. Before I resume my seat,