

to as "the employer's contribution") and also, on behalf of, and to the exclusion of, the employed person, the contribution payable by that person.

What is the necessity for the words "to the exclusion of"? Is it intended that the employee shall never have an opportunity to pay?

Mr. McLARTY: The intention is to avoid payment being made twice.

Mr. MacNICOL: Are the contributions going to be paid in stamps?

Mr. McLARTY: It is provided that they may be paid in stamps, or such other method as the commission permits.

Mr. MacNICOL: The minister knows that in Great Britain they have cards, and the manufacturer or employer puts a stamp on for himself and one for the workman. There is no stamp for the government. The government takes care of that when the card comes back.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That would not be possible under this measure. It must be done by the employer.

Mr. McLARTY: He would have to affix the stamp.

Mr. MacNICOL: In Great Britain the employee does not put anything on; it is put on by the employer.

Mr. McLARTY: The same is true in this instance.

Mr. GREEN: Why is that exclusion made?

Mr. McLARTY: So that there would be no question of double payment being demanded.

Section agreed to.

Section 19 agreed to.

On section 20—Manager to be treated as employer.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I move that the first paragraph of section 20 be amended to read as follows:

In any cases or classes of cases where employed persons work under the general control and management of some person other than the owner employer, such as the agent or manager of a mine or quarry, or the occupier of a factory or workshop, the commission may by regulation provide that—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the change?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is a change in drafting.

The CHAIRMAN: And it is a new amendment, or one which does not appear in the list.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is correct. This is the only one which came in after the committee dealt with the matter yesterday. It is a change in drafting which has been suggested by the legal experts. The changes are these: The word "their" is changed to "the", the word "immediate" is changed to "owner", and the word "owner" in line 16 is stricken out.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The object is to provide that no one shall escape?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, precisely.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 21 agreed to.

On section 22—Liability of employer of person with certificate of exemption.

Mr. MacNICOL: As I understand it, the employer of a person who holds a certificate of exemption under section 16 shall be liable to pay the like contributions as would be payable by him as employer's contributions. Why does he have to pay contributions?

Mr. McLARTY: The reason is to remove the incentive of the employer to employ those having exemptions. In this respect the present measure is the same as the British act. This provision is to prevent the employer from picking up employees who have certificates of exemption, so that he might be relieved from the liability of paying into the unemployment insurance fund.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am in accord with the principle, but I am wondering how the scheme will work out if there are many such cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They are exceptional cases.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am referring to those cases where the employer would contribute, but not the employee.

Mr. McLARTY: I would suppose that would be a windfall for the unemployment insurance fund, but it is a situation which is not likely to arise often. It was found necessary to put that provision in the British act, and we thought that in this instance it would reduce the incentive to employ persons holding certificates of exemption.

Mr. MacNICOL: I agree it is necessary to prevent anything of that kind.

Section agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.