

be contributing to the fund. They will be contributing, although for half the year they will be losing fifty per cent of their time. It seems to me, therefore, that at no time can they come into benefit under the bill as worded.

Mr. McLARTY: The commission would have to determine what the normal working week was. If it determines that a man has been working his normal working week, then he will be entitled to the benefits of the measure.

Mr. NEILL: There is a coal mine in my district and, as I doped out the Bennett legislation, the men would get no benefit, for the same reason which my hon. friend has given. At times when things were dull they worked for only three days a week, but they had to be idle for nine days before they could get any benefit, although they would be paying their full contribution. This was brought to Mr. Bennett's attention, and he inserted a clause to provide that the idle days should be lumped together and carried on, so to speak. I understood the minister to say that some arrangement was being made under this bill to meet the objection which the hon. member has raised.

Mr. McLARTY: I understand that under the continuity rule of 1935 the situation which my hon. friends have brought up arose, and it was to meet that situation that we put in the number of days. I am advised that such a difficulty will not arise.

Mr. JACKMAN: If a man is employed for three days a week for a number of weeks; that is, if he is out of a job for three days and then gets a job and the next week he is out again, the three days of unemployment in each week will count as part of the nine days so that after three weeks he will be able to receive the benefit?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): It does not have to be nine consecutive days?

Mr. McLARTY: No.

Section agreed to.

Section 37 agreed to.

On section 38—Only periods of bona fide employment to count in computing benefits.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Would he not get the benefit of his contributions unless his employment were proved to be bona fide?

Mr. McLARTY: He could not. He could not put a stamp on it and thereby obtain the benefit as if he had worked. It must be bona fide work.

Section agreed to.

Sections 39 and 40 agreed to.

On section 41—Benefits inalienable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This means it shall not be attachable?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 42—Regulations in respect of special classes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Will the minister explain this section?

Mr. McLARTY: The purpose of the section is, of course, to give the commission the right to deal with certain situations that arise, which cannot be thrown into a general class and cannot be classified in categories, and which consequently can be deemed to be anomalies. This gives the commission power to deal with such situations as piece-workers, those working for less than a full week, and various other factors which we could not cover completely in the bill itself.

Section agreed to.

On section 43—Disqualification through loss of work due to labour dispute.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I would point out that paragraph (f) has been deleted and paragraph (g) now becomes paragraph (f).

Mrs. NIELSEN: I wish to say something about paragraph (a), (i) and (ii). I have always understood that it was the right of labour in this dominion to organize. This paragraph may be in the best interests of the employer but not perhaps in the best interests of labour, if we leave it as it stands. It is not always so much the use of different clauses but the abuse of them that has to be guarded against when it comes to administration. I did not have an opportunity to attend the committee where the various organizations came to present their case, but I have had various letters sent to me from different organizations in this country. I have a letter from the secretary of the Canadian Textile Workers Union, and I should like to quote a small portion which has to do with this particular clause. This is an official statement signed by the secretary and chairman. They say:

"Insured" workers are automatically disqualified from benefit if discharged for "misconduct" or participation in a labour dispute with employers. This means that workers who would build their unions are in constant danger of being discharged for "misconduct", the declarations of the government to the contrary notwithstanding. This also means that the members of trade unions would be subjected to a newer and more widespread system of espionage and hence intimidated from discussing grievances at meetings of their trade unions.