

eight men who are laid off in Kitchener; will their fare to Toronto be paid? There is nothing in the bill which makes any provision for that. Is it a matter of regulation?

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps section 91 will provide an answer to the question of the hon. member for Waterloo South.

Section agreed to.

Sections 89 and 90 agreed to.

On section 91—Advances to workers seeking employment.

Mr. HOMUTH: Whatever is advanced to these workers is simply a loan, which they will have to pay back?

Mr. McLARTY: Correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is this in the British act?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, it is.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To what extent is it operative in Britain?

Mr. McLARTY: I am advised that it amounts to about £4,000 a year.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course Britain is a country of short distances.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I had forgotten that there was such a provision in this bill. This is a rather dangerous provision, yet I can see that there may be a necessity for it.

Mr. McLARTY: I am advised that in Great Britain the recovery has been about 95 per cent.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Good. Excellent.

Mr. MacNICOL: In Great Britain the head office is in London, and London is connected by teletype with the branch offices. The worker goes into one of these offices and hands in his card, and every office in London is notified that such and such a man is available for service. In the same way they are connected with offices in Manchester, Birmingham and other centres. The question asked by the hon. member for Waterloo South is quite pertinent. His city is a manufacturing centre. Suppose eight rubber workers are laid off in Kitchener; by what means will the head office in Toronto be notified; and if there is work in Toronto for five, six, seven or eight rubber workers, how are they going to get in contact with the expectant employer? Would the fare be advanced for them to go to Toronto? They would need more than that; they would need something to tide them over until they had received their first pay.

The system in the old country has been operating since 1911, and in my judgment it is the finest in the world. I have sat and watched the officials for hours working both in branch offices and in the central office. It is a pleasure to see men coming up to the counter and being addressed by their first name. The officials in all the offices get to know many workers by their first name, and I hope that will happen here. In the old country on one occasion a teletype statement came in saying that a number of boiler makers were wanted. A good many of them had to have their fares advanced to enable them to go to other offered work. The question asked by my hon. friend is, what provision is being made in that regard?

Mr. ROEBUCK: On the question of the efficiency of the British system, the committee might be interested in a letter received by one of the employment offices in the old country. It reads something like this: "My daughter Gladys has paid into your scheme for four years and every time she tries to get a bit of benefit you find her a job. It isn't fair."

Mr. HOMUTH: Under subsection 3 of section 91, suppose an employer asked for an advance, which he might do under the clause; he might ask for an advance for the worker.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The employer?

Mr. HOMUTH: The potential employer. If he asks for an advance and the money is given to enable the workers to come to his plant, which is some distance away, I do not see anything that gives him the right to deduct the advance from the wages of the men so hired.

Mr. McLARTY: Subsection 2 covers that:

Any sum advanced in accordance with such regulations shall be a debt due to the commission recoverable by process of law.

Mr. HOMUTH: Recoverable by the commission. But under this clause an employer can ask the commission to advance money to an employee.

Mr. McLARTY: Does it not then become a debt owing to the commission if the commission advances to the employee, at the request of the employer?

Mr. HOMUTH: The employer is responsible for it and it is recoverable from the employer but not from the employee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is no provision to take it out of the wages of the particular employee.