

Mr. NEILL: As long as he gets the application in the post office?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 31—Fulfilment of third statutory condition.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I should like an explanation of section 31(b).

Mr. McLARTY: Has the hon. member's question particular reference to a labour dispute?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Yes.

Mr. McLARTY: If the hon. member will refer to section 43, I believe he will see the significance of this paragraph.

Section agreed to.

Section 32 agreed to.

On section 33—Periods not counted in computing unemployment, et cetera.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre) moved:

That the word "remuneration" in line 10 be deleted and the word "wages" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre) moved:

That the word "of" in line 22 be deleted and that the word "or" be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 34—Period in respect of which benefit is payable.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre) moved:

That the word "stated" on the last line of page 11 be deleted and that the word "afore-said" be inserted on the first line of page 12 after the words "three years".

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MacNICOL: Just one word. I have been trying to figure out this matter, but I do not want to hold up the proceedings, and the minister can give me an answer more quickly than I can figure it out. Assuming that a workman has been employed in the past five years for 200 days a year, or, in all, a thousand days, and then he becomes unemployed, for how many days will he receive compensation?

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps the hon. member for Davenport would let me explain without giving such large figures.

[Mr. McLarty.]

Mr. MacNICOL: I used those figures because they are easy to reckon.

Mr. McLARTY: Suppose in the first year a man worked for thirty weeks, he would then be entitled, under what is called the one-fifth rule, to six weeks' benefits. Suppose in the following year he worked for another thirty weeks, he would be again entitled to one-fifth, or six weeks, but with a deduction of one day for every three on which he had drawn benefit in the previous year. That means that in the two years he would be drawing one-fifth of sixty, which is twelve, less one-third of the benefit he drew in the six weeks which he had taken in the first year, which would be two weeks; so in the aggregate in the two years he would have ten weeks.

Mr. MacNICOL: But my question was, assuming the man had worked steadily for five years?

Mr. McLARTY: One year's benefit.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is very good.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 35 agreed to.

On section 36—Waiting days not counted for benefit.

Mr. GILLIS: Our problem in Nova Scotia is not one of total unemployment but rather one of partial employment. During the winter months the men work for three days a week. Do I understand that in order to come under this bill the worker must have been totally unemployed, or in what way is the number of days computed?

Mr. McLARTY: I do not know whether I get the significance of the question. In this bill it is not altogether a matter of weeks; it is 180 days in the year. Does that answer the question?

Mr. GILLIS: It does not. This is an unemployment insurance bill. Do I understand that in order to qualify one must be totally unemployed?

Mr. McLARTY: That is correct.

Mr. GILLIS: As far as the mining industry in Nova Scotia is concerned, the men will receive no benefits under this bill—that is, the men employed at the present time—for the simple reason that, so far as I can see, at no time will they be totally unemployed. During the summer they do work steadily, five or six days a week, but in the winter months they lose fifty per cent of their employment owing to the fact that coal cannot be shipped, and notwithstanding that they will