26. On the whole, that clause seems to favour unemployment insurance claimants. However, two comments are called for: On one hand, this clause is inconsistent with section 148(1) of the regulations and on the other hand, the last part of the clause provides that an interruption of earnings would be determined when an insured person is no longer working for an employer, and also when a reduction in his hours of work for that employer results in a prescribed reduction in earnings.

In my opinion, it would be wise to know the wording of the regulations governing the reduction in earnings mentioned in this clause. Obviously, this amendment is part of the work sharing program proposed in Bill C-27. That is why it is essential to know exactly and specifically all the implictions and provisions involved in this amendment. If we refer to clause 27, it says that the determination of an insurable job comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Revenue. Mr. Speaker, how many times we, as members of parliament, regardless of party lines, had to make numerous phone calls to the revenue deputy minister to obtain a ruling on the insurability of some employment. At this level of procedure, considerable delays are due, on the one hand, to the volume of applications made to the deputy minister and, on the other hand, to the usual dilatoriness of officials when dealing with unemployment insurance benefits matters.

Many of the petty annoyances of the civil service are also attached to the fact that determination of insurability has more to do with the Department of National Revenue than the Unemployment Insurance Commission. Since work sharing is a new way of granting subsidies to the enterprise, it is more likely that many employers will avail themselves of this new form of assistance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would be wise to know immediately what will be the insurable and non-insurable jobs so as to avoid excessive number of appeals before the administrative court that is the commission or the Department of National Revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we recommend therefore that determination of insurability of salaries for shared work as well as for other kinds of employment be left with the Canada Employment and immigration Commission.

This afternoon we had the opportunity to hear hon. members on clause 29 of the bill. Mr. Speaker, requiring a claimant to have at least twelve weeks of insurable employment to be eligible for unemployment benefits is like launching a direct charge against the unemployed in making believe that they are responsible for their own predicament. This new provision proposed by the government is a direct attack against the most deprived among the working class, because the majority of workers who qualify with a minimum number of weeks of insurable employment are the following as the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) pointed out so well this afternoon. The first group is older workers and those with a low income and a low level of education who generally keep their jobs for a shorter period of time because the kinds of jobs they are offered, or which are available to them, are often short term jobs. Second, students who no longer wish to continue their education and who as a first experience were hired for a summer period find themselves disentitled to unemployment insurance benefits under this new provision. Third, workers who work in the fruit, vegetable and tobacco fields in various provinces of Canada.

That proposed provision by the government does not take into consideration at all modern personnel hiring requirements in private, public or even parapublic industry. More and more frequently businesses only need skilled workers for a short period of time; skilled workers are generally hired for a specific short term job.

Let us look at clause 31, another provision of the government's proposed legislation to save at the expense of workers on compensation. Why limit the privilege of an extended qualifying period only to those workers who receive the maximum compensation for work inquiry? That clause discriminates against workers on compensation who do not get the maximum amounts obtainable on compensation. The proposed application of this clause would be unfair to workers on compensation who cannot work because of their work injury and who receive temporary total workmen's compensation payments and it is also unfair to those who receive permanent partial workmen's compensation payments.

All injured workers who cannot take their usual job back on a regular basis because of their work injury and who have the courage to work on a temporary basis should indiscriminately be able to get an extension of the qualifying period. There is a section in the act which I am happy to say will be advantageous in many cases. I am happy to have been one of the first promotors of that amendment. The Unemployment Insurance Commission could disqualify any person who had worked more than four weeks and less than eight.

The same Commission could disqualify that person as long as that person could not work. I even asked the minister at that time here in this House whether he thought it was good to encourage people to go back to work after a long period of unemployment. But in the area I have the pleasure to represent the rate of unemployment is not very very high, but the number of unemployed is still too high for us. How many times did people work at the request of the Unemployment Insurance Commission? Those same people after a period of four, six and even seven weeks had to leave their job because of a bankruptcy and absolutely nothing could be done to correct that problem.

After a few weeks of work, those people had to go to the Quebec welfare department to survive. I do not want to miss the opportunity to congratulate the minister for having done away with those controversial clauses and I hope the minister will listen to the suggestions put forward by opposition or government members, particularly the proposal of the member for Timiskaming to postpone for six months the third reading of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have other remarks to make on this bill, but first I would like to comment on clause 33. Mr. Speaker, that clause certainly demonstrates a degree of refinement and subtlety attained by juggling civil servants, supported by an anti-labour government, to express their disgust toward the