

Mr. GILLIS: Have you talked to any of the members in the services who may be affected by this bill as to whether or not they are willing to make that contribution? A great many of them are rather skeptical about taking more off their pay cheque.

The WITNESS: I think that is true, Mr. Chairman. Naturally, we have not been able to contact any large number of them. We are thinking, as the Legion almost invariably does, of those people who are likely to find themselves being discharged, as I say in the brief, for medical reasons and so on. They, after all, are the people in whom we are interested. There is no question about it; there will be a number, as there are in all phases of employment throughout the country, who will not be too fond of the idea of contributing to this fund, but by and large I think I can say that we have the interests of the unfortunate people in mind in suggesting this.

Mr. GOODE: You do not set a time limit in regard to this first paragraph of comment. According to this, a person could join the armed forces and leave the following day, or perhaps within two weeks, and he would still be able to draw unemployment insurance; is that what you mean? Are you including that group of people? You set no time limit as far as enlistment is concerned.

The WITNESS: We are putting them in exactly the same category as an employee in any other industry, are we not? We want them to have the same benefits.

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: You would want the same conditions that apply to ordinary civilian employees—

The WITNESS: That is correct.

Mr. GOODE: It did not say that in the brief.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: There is no compulsory feature about this, is there?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not see how you could possibly let some come in and keep others out. When you bring a certain class in under the Unemployment Insurance Act you bring the whole group in.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): Have you taken into consideration the fact that the army, the air force and the navy deduct 5 to 6 per cent at the present time from the pay of people who serve which, if they stay in for a long period, is applied to their pension, but which, if they get out, let us say, in five years, is given to them in a lump sum, with the result that an officer at the end of the five-year term could receive a payment of \$3,000, and a private, a payment of \$1,000 to \$1,500, plus the fact that they get a longer period of leave with pay at the end of the term amounting to many days. Those benefits I think would amount to much more than ordinary unemployment insurance. I was wondering if the Legion had taken cognizance of those two benefits that do apply to the armed services, when they submitted this brief?

The WITNESS: Yes, we are of course aware of the superannuation benefits available to them on discharge or release, but that still does not completely protect the individual who for medical reasons has to be discharged a year or two after enlistment.

Mr. BENNETT (*Grey North*): Would he be entitled to unemployment insurance if he was not able to work?

The WITNESS: If he were in insurable employment previous to his enlistment.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Do we judge from this that it is largely for the protection of the short-term servicemen?

The WITNESS: Yes, I think, frankly speaking, that is the group which would benefit to the greatest extent by this. A man who makes a career of the armed forces and stays in until he comes to the period when his superannuation will pay benefits will actually lose, as a matter of fact.