

I have no intention at this time of making a detailed examination of the clauses of the bill; it would be a waste of time. As the bill is considered clause by clause we shall have opportunity of registering our objections, expressing our opinions and getting answers to questions.

Two classes that I am sorry are not included in the measure are the seamen and the fishermen. I have some knowledge of their problems, and I believe there is no class of workers in Canada more in need of the protection of such a measure. This was forcibly brought to my attention only this morning by the receipt of a telegram from the Canadian Seamen's Union, which reads:

Canadian Seamen's Union on behalf of thousands of seamen and fishermen protest discrimination in proposed unemployment insurance bill in leaving us out from benefits of said bill. Seamen and fishermen are greatly affected by unemployment and we urge you give serious consideration to rectify this injustice.

I realize that to attempt at the present time to inject other classifications into the bill would upset the whole actuarial basis on which the bill is worked out. Perhaps it is not possible to have these classifications included. Nevertheless I put myself on record as deprecating the fact that these men, who have a serious unemployment problem year in and year out—with particular reference to the fishermen—are left out. As the leader of the opposition very well put it a few days ago, the fisherman appears to be the forgotten man as far as parliaments and legislative bodies throughout Canada are concerned. I know no other class of workers in Canada more afflicted by unemployment than that group. I presume that we shall have an opportunity to propose amendments later, looking to the inclusion of these groups.

There is another class of people who probably do not come to the minds of many members of parliament, but because of the fact that I have been associated with them over a long period of time I am very familiar with the conditions affecting them. I am referring now to men who are in positions of leadership in trades unions, of whom there are thousands across Canada. They leave their regular occupations to accept office in the unions, but under this bill they are given no protection against unemployment. Every year or two they must take part in an election, with the chance of being defeated. Once they leave their position with the union, by reason of being voted out, they enter the ranks of the unemployed but though they have given of their services to the benefit of the people of Canada over a period of years, when through no fault of their own they become unemployed they do not come under

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

the benefits of this bill. This is particularly unfortunate, because for a long period of time these men have been fighting for the very measure now before the committee.

There is another aspect of the bill which I should like to stress, and about which those who are interested in having the terms of the bill implemented should be most concerned. I refer to the administration of the act after it is finally passed. I have had considerable experience with compensation boards and similar organizations set up by governments to administer acts. Once a commission is appointed it becomes a law unto itself. The act may read all right, as our compensation acts read all right; the bill may be made as perfect as possible, yet when that commission is appointed it has full jurisdiction over the administration of the act. In my experience it inevitably happens that a three or four man board interprets an act as it sees it and as it wants it to function, and in the final analysis perhaps seventy-five per cent of the material good that should accrue to the people for whom you are attempting to legislate is lost through these people placing their own interpretation upon the terms of the act. We have had many unhappy experiences of this kind with compensation boards, because the English language can be construed to mean almost anything. That is why I say this bill should be discussed section by section, so that the minister can give us his interpretation of the different provisions of the bill. Then, when the commission is set up, at least we shall have *Hansard* to show what was the intention of the government in connection with the bill.

I do not want to occupy any more of the time of the committee. I merely wanted to identify myself with the measure, and to say that as representing an industrial constituency—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Many of the sections are fully explained in the report of the committee, and this is something very unusual in committee proceedings.

Mr. GILLIS: Would the report of the committee be taken as an authority in regard to the interpretation of the act later on?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It would be a guide.

Mr. GILLIS: I think the minister's answers would contain the proper interpretation. As I started to say, I do not want to occupy any more of the time of this committee, though I may have a good many questions to ask as the different sections are dealt with. I merely want to put myself on record as being perfectly satisfied with the