

agricultural project, a bookkeeper or an accountant, is deemed a bookkeeper or an accountant, not an agriculturist.

Section agreed to.

Section 51 agreed to.

On section 52—Insurance officers.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is intended to be set up by this section?

Mr. McLARTY: This section sets up the officers that will be employed by the commission: an insurance officer who will be attached to the employment office, a referee to whom an appeal can be made from the insurance officer, and the umpire and deputy umpire. In connection with the latter, there are generally very few of them; probably there will not be more than one or two umpires in Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The intention is to use a judge of the court?

Mr. McLARTY: It is an important position.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Briefly what will be their duty?

Mr. McLARTY: They have the final adjudication in matters of claims.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All classes of claims?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes. In Great Britain, for example, the decisions of the umpires are published, like supreme court judgments.

Section agreed to.

On section 53—Court of referees.

Mr. MacNICOL: Will there be a limitation on the expenses and allowances of officials under this statute? It always amuses me, when the government sends three men to Geneva or some other place, to find them come back with different expense accounts. There should be some uniformity, I think. I do not like to see half a dozen men, doing the same work, show a great variation in their expense accounts. I would be in favour of the smallest account, not the largest.

Mr. McLARTY: I will bear in mind the observations of the hon. member. In the meantime, so far as the statutory powers and rights are concerned in the matter of payment, they are dealt with in subsection 5 of this section.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the hon. member for Davenport has done a

good job in calling attention to this point. I remember the expense account of Hon. Peter Heenan when he went to Geneva.

Section agreed to.

Sections 54 to 58 inclusive agreed to.

On section 59—Associations which may appeal on behalf of a claimant member.

Mr. MacNICOL: What is the significance of an association conducting an appeal?

Mr. McLARTY: I suppose, so that where an association wishes to take up the cudgels, shall we say, on behalf of a claimant who feels he has been mistreated, it will have the privilege of doing so.

Section agreed to.

Sections 60 and 61 agreed to.

On section 62—Decisions of umpire final.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The umpire is a judge, is he not?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And it is not intended that there shall be any appeal from his decision?

Mr. McLARTY: Not beyond the umpire.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think that is reasonable.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Except that the claimant may perhaps sue the statutory body of the commission.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would there be a review of the decision of the umpire by way of a crown writ?

Mr. McLARTY: I imagine there would be, as in the ordinary case if it were suggested that the commission or the umpire were exceeding its or his power. I imagine the usual right of a mandatory order by the court could be applied for.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On the ground of excessive jurisdiction or lack of jurisdiction?

Mr. McLARTY: Precisely.

Section agreed to.

Section 63 agreed to.

On section 64—Authority to rescind or amend decision.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I see that an insurance officer has power to amend any decision given in any particular claim. Will there be any appeal from that decision?