

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: I also should like to ask the honourable gentleman a question. Has the Government given any consideration whatever to the exemption of married women from the provisions of this Act?

Before the honourable gentleman answers the question, I should like to make a few remarks. We all know that at present many married women who have never worked before since their marriage are now employed. The husbands of many of these women have full-time positions and receive good incomes, but the Government, companies and individuals who are short of help have persuaded the women to accept positions. I have two of them working for me. There is absolutely no chance that these married women will be able to collect back from the Unemployment Insurance Commission anything on account of the premiums that are being paid in by themselves and their employers. At least, I do not know of any provision that would allow them to make a claim. I may be wrong in making that statement, but I do not think I am, for after the war is over nobody will be expected to give employment to married women, and when they step out of their wartime positions they will not be considered unemployed. It seems to me they should be exempted under the Act, and I should like to know if the Government has given any consideration to that matter.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Of course, I cannot answer the question in the way in which it is put. I do not know whether the Government has or has not given any consideration to that. But there is in the Act a provision that may help my honourable friend. Paragraph (p) of Part II of the First Schedule of the Act authorizes the commission to exempt employment which is "of such a nature that it is ordinarily adopted as subsidiary employment only and not as the principal means of livelihood." It may be that where a woman simply takes a job to fill in spare time, her normal occupation being that of housekeeper—

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: There are thousands of such women right now.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: It may be that the provision I have just quoted would form a good basis upon which to apply for exemption in such cases.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: I know that married women and their employers are now paying the money in every week.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Has any application been made for an exemption?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: I could not say. I never thought of the matter until I was reading these amendments, and then it struck me that something should be done with regard to the case of married women.

I may say that I have read the Act very carefully, and all the amendments, and I have no serious objection to any of them. Before taking my seat I want to congratulate the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) very heartily upon the manner in which he has explained the Bill, and to thank him for the information he has given. May I ask him if he can state the exact amount that it has cost the country every year to run the Unemployment Insurance Commission?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: If the Bill is referred to committee and is taken up there to-morrow morning, I shall make it my business to find that out for the honourable gentleman.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I think if the honourable senator from West Central Saskatchewan (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) would look at section 16 of the Bill he would find what he is looking for. That amends section 93 of the Act by adding the following subsection:

Any special order made under the provisions of this Act may be varied or revoked, by a special order made in like manner.

The explanatory note says:

This subsection is new and is intended to remove any possible doubt as to the power of the commission to vary or revoke any special order made under the provisions of the Act.

In reference to the point raised by the honourable senator from Kingston (Hon. Mr. Davies), may I say that I think he and others will remember that five or six years ago some 25,000 or 30,000 railroad men, with from five to twenty-five years' seniority, were unemployed. Such a condition no longer exists, as these men all are working now and paying their ante into the unemployment insurance fund; but some unemployment may develop later, although, we hope, not to as great an extent.

I want to touch briefly on section 22 of the Bill. I spoke to the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) when I came into the building to-night, and he gave me some information of which I previously had not the slightest inkling. The explanatory note opposite section 22 says:

The present ceiling of \$2,000 is raised to \$2,400 and the first proviso to the section, as amended, is entirely new.

That sounds very well, but it does not tell the story. The new limit is up to \$3,600 or