

men in every other plant and this included a lot of subcontractors who would be doing jobs at those other plants, and I have had a good deal of complaint about being disqualified from drawing benefits because of that fact.

Mr. STARR: You are referring to a situation where there is a strike and a subcontractor in that plant doing some renovation work or reconstruction work is unemployed but is unable to draw unemployment insurance. I am subject to correction on this, but to qualify for unemployment insurance they must attempt to go back on their job. If they do not make that attempt they are disqualified. If they do make the attempts to go back on the job and are restrained by the picket line, then there is some consideration in regard to that.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): Well in this case, there was no picket line. The company simply locked them out all over the province. There was no picket line, there was no job to go to.

Mr. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, the stipulation under the disqualification section of the act is first of all the claimant must have lost his employment through labour dispute and then he must prove to us that he is neither participating in any dispute, financing a dispute nor personally interested in its outcome. It is up to him to prove those three things and sometimes it is very difficult. If he is a member of a greater class any of whom is participating, financing or personally interested in the outcome of the dispute, if he was a carpenter and the carpenters went out on strike, for example, then regardless of who he is working for he loses his job and he is personally interested in the outcome of that strike, that is, whether he would get an increase or a decrease, then he is disqualified.

Mr. BROWNE (*Vancouver-Kingsway*): Taking one particular case, this man was a machinist fitter of some description. It was the teamsters who went on strike and this man had no connection with the teamsters union. The job he was employed on was not the one that struck but the employer decided to lock out the whole province and he was employed as a subcontractor.

Mr. MCGREGOR: If it is possible to send us the particulars of that particular case because the matter is terribly involved—we would be only too happy to look into the particular case if you would send it to us.

Mr. MUIR (*Cape Breton North and Victoria*): Mr. Chairman, if a man is paying insurance for a period of five or ten years and then moves to a job which is not insurable, \$4,800, and after that finds himself out of employment, can he then file a claim?

Mr. MCGREGOR: Yes, we protect him for a further two years, in other words, in order to claim payment he must have made contributions for 104 weeks. We can extend that to 208 weeks if he is engaged in the meantime in employment that is not insurable or for incapacity or mental or physical illness.

Mr. MUIR (*Cape Breton North and Victoria*): Was the period of time always two years or was there a period when it was three years?

Mr. MCGREGOR: No, two years has always been the maximum.

Mr. GRAFFTEY: Mr. Chairman, up until relatively recently I had the opinion of the department officials that the average working man did not realize or does not realize that your National Employment offices were and are set up in a very adequate way to find jobs for people of every kind. Is this new policy designed to make the individual man more aware of the fact that it is actually an office they can go to? In my own experience I find I am telling a lot of men this for the first time, "Go to your national employment service." Unfortunately they think it is an unemployment office and they do not realize