

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I see in the English act they have a provision that no one is supposed to give up or submit any documents that might incriminate him.

Mr. BENNETT: I think our act is sufficiently broad without that.

Subsection agreed to.

Subsection 4 agreed to.

Section 34 agreed to.

On section 35, subsection 1—Unemployment insurance fund.

Mr. VENIOT: I suppose it would not be in order under this clause to discuss the matter of the actuarial computation. Is there not another section held over?

Mr. BENNETT: I think I held the section over for the hon. gentleman.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 2—Contributions out of moneys provided by parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): If the fund to be created under this act had a deficit would the deficit be made good by vote of parliament in a subsequent year?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman is of course touching upon the vital point that gave so much concern in England, and which still is doing so. This act does not contemplate a deficit: that is all I can usefully say. I can answer his question purely as a lawyer by saying that parliament can of course cure any defect in respect to it, and make good any deficit that might arise, whether after or before the fact. Parliament's power would extend that far. But the act is based on the assumption that there will not be a deficit.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is also based on certain insurable employments and certain excepted employments. We had a general discussion the other evening as to whether the commission as such could take any excepted employments and make them insurable. Naturally if that were done it would alter the actuarial basis of this bill. Does the Prime Minister mean to convey that the actuarial basis is sound enough to make the scheme carry itself even if any of the excepted employments were taken in?

Mr. BENNETT: If they were analogous employments that would be so; and it is in the power of the commission to deal with anomalies under the act. If for instance the British Columbia loggers were brought under the act it could not interfere with the solvency of the fund.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): After the discussion the other evening I looked up the anomalies sections of the British act. There I think they are very much restricted as to how far they can add employments. Of course under the 1934 act practically everyone is included, but before that it was limited. Unless there is some direction from this committee to the commission I am afraid the commission are going to be very much restricted in their power to transfer any employment from the excepted class to the insurable employments. I still think that would affect to a certain extent the financial basis of the fund. The point I want to establish is that if such took place, would application have to be made by the minister to parliament for further funds, in case the present basis were not enough to carry the scheme?

Mr. BENNETT: It is quite obvious that under the terms of this statute as printed the payment into the fund of moneys other than those received from sources one, two and three, the latter being the state itself, is not contemplated. And the limitation imposed in the section now under consideration upon the payments to be made by the state does not of course deal with the costs of administration. There is power to make payments under governor general's warrant, but as the hon. gentleman knows as a former minister, no governor general's warrant can be permitted to stand without having an estimate placed before the house to cover the amount mentioned in the warrant. So I think I must answer his question in the negative.

With respect to the anomalies clause I also looked into it since we were last discussing it. Under the English act the provisions were rather restrictive, and if there is any doubt with respect to some of these matters I propose to make it clear. But it is not contemplated that the commission as such can enlarge the scope of the act except with respect to matters that will not change the actuarial basis. I am advised that the introduction of additional numbers of substantially the same class would have no other effect than that of increasing the number participating.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): So that generally speaking any of the excepted classes cannot be brought under the insurable employments clause except by action of some future parliament?

Mr. BENNETT: That is the general principle, yes.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) I think yesterday cited a class of individuals that he said investigation