

thought wise to add the clause in view of the wide training and retraining in which we are now endeavouring to be engaged.

Mr. GREEN: Was there any such provision in the act of 1935?

Mr. McLARTY: No. It is a new provision.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is in the British act.

Mr. GREEN: Will the commission have any personnel who are qualified to direct training or courses of one kind or another?

Mr. McLARTY: The answer would be, no. The provision simply gives the power to refuse to grant the benefits to those who will not take the courses to which they may be directed. As far as the commission is concerned, it will not set up any courses on its own account.

Mr. GREEN: How is it going to be decided or directed which course a man shall take?

Mr. McLARTY: It will be purely a matter of cooperation between those who are prescribing courses and the officers of the commission.

Mr. GREEN: Will they advise as to what kind of training a man should take?

Mr. McLARTY: I imagine that when the plan is working there will be a definite connecting link between the various bodies which direct training and retraining, and the commission. I must be a little vague about that because, as my hon. friend will appreciate, it is an administrative matter which has not yet been worked out.

Mr. GREEN: Will the commission be taking over the youth training programme?

Mr. McLARTY: No, not at all.

Mr. MacNICOL: With reference to the 180 days, it is assumed, of course, that the worker obtains his card. He might work for twenty days for one firm; then turn his card in, and be sent out to work for another firm for thirty days, or he might work for two or three days. The whole total of 180 days in two years is what he bases his claim upon.

Mr. McLARTY: That is correct.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In paragraphs (ii) and (iii) of the section it states that the insured person has to prove that he has been unemployed "on each day on which he claims to have been unemployed." Who will decide what the nature of that proof is to be?

Mr. McLARTY: He proves that by registration at the exchange.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: With regard to the word "suitable" in paragraph (iii), by which

he is required to prove that he has been "unable to obtain suitable employment," who will decide whether the employment is suitable for that particular man?

Mr. McLARTY: That word "suitable" will be covered, I believe, when we come to section 31.

Section agreed to.

Section 29 agreed to.

On section 30—Period of unemployment to begin on date of application.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not see it here, but I read somewhere that a period of nine days had to elapse before a man can begin to draw benefit.

Mr. McLARTY: That comes under section 36.

Mr. MacNICOL: Does the benefit start on the day of his application?

Mr. McLARTY: No.

Mr. MacNICOL: A period of nine days must elapse?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Mr. MacNICOL: Under most acts, I believe, the period is six days. I believe that in England it is six days.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): In the United States it is fourteen days.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, much higher. I believe that the waiting period in this bill is the same as in the 1935 act.

Mr. MacNICOL: In other words, he will be really unemployed for nine days before he receives any compensation?

Mr. McLARTY: That is correct.

Mr. NEILL: Will the minister tell us about this date: "A period of unemployment shall be deemed to begin on the date on which the insured person makes application." He may be a hundred miles away from the place to which the application is sent. Is it the date he mails the letter or the date when the letter arrives, or what? It is all very well in a town like Montreal, but suppose the man is at a place a hundred miles away from the government office to which this application should be given. Does the period begin on the day the application reaches the office, or the day the letter is mailed, or when?

Mr. McLARTY: May I refer the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to section 92, paragraph (g). The applicant can use the post office as well.