

not to count in continuous period of unemployment unless due to disease or disablement, has been struck out, and a new subsection is added which I am bound to say is an improvement.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is there any change in principle in the amendment?

Mr. BENNETT: I think not. I will read it.

(5) Any period during which a person—
(i) fails to fulfil the second or third statutory condition, or

(ii) is, under the provisions of this act, disqualified for receiving benefit, or

(iii) is, under the provisions of this act, deemed not to be unemployed, shall be excluded in the computation of continuous periods of unemployment unless that person proves that the failure to fulfil the said statutory conditions or the disqualification for receiving benefit was due to incapacity for work arising from some definite disease or bodily or mental disablement.

The general principle of it I think may be said to be maintained.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is just put into three groups, one, two and three?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. In the same section on page 12, line 13, the word "good" preceding the word "employer" has been struck out and the words "reasonable and fair" substituted therefor. I think that is a definite improvement. The term "good" as applied to an employer is not as apt a description as the term "reasonable and fair." In line 23 of the proviso the same change is made. Those are all the changes at that point.

In the last paragraphs of the last sub-clause of section 20, that is on page 13, line 2, after the word "shift" are inserted the words "in the occupation or," so that it reads:

On any day which is recognized as a holiday for his grade or class or shift in the occupation or at the factory, workshop or other premises at which he is employed.

The same change is made after the word "shift" in line 7, and the words "or place" in line 8 are struck out.

There are no changes in the succeeding sections 21, 22, 23 and 24. In section 25 the word "and" at the end of paragraph (c) of subsection 1 is struck out and after the word "them" in paragraph (d) of subsection 1, the word "and" is added. Paragraph (e) is then added as follows:

(e) persons who by custom of their occupation, trade or industry or pursuant to their agreement with an employer or paid, in whole or in part, by the piece or on a basis other than that of time.

That is to cover the piece goods worker.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That broadens the scope of the section.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. Then in line 30, after the words "respect to" are inserted the words "contributions and the payment thereof and with respect to," so that it reads:

With respect to contributions and the payment thereof and with respect to the receipt of benefit.

That makes it clearer. Section 28 on page 18 is amended by adding after the word "division" in the first line of the section, the words "established under section 11 of this act," so that it reads:

The commission may in each regional division established under section 11 of this act—

And so forth. Then in the fourth line of this section between the word "each" and the word "regional" is inserted the word "such," and in the next line the words "established under section 11 of this act" have been struck out. In other words, the words "established under section 11 of this act" have been given their true meaning by being removed from the second line of subsection 2.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Did the senate not make an amendment to section 27?

Mr. BENNETT: Did I not read that?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): No.

Mr. BENNETT: The proviso in lines 25 to 28 is struck out. That is a departure from the principle adopted by the house. It is one striking example of it, and there is another departure. There is no appeal now granted by reference to the exchequer court; the decision of the commission is final. It will be remembered that the question was discussed in this chamber, and after hearing the representations made to the select committee in the senate, the senate adopted the view that there should be no appeal, that the matter should be decided by the commission.

I have dealt with section 28. There is no change in section 29, or in section 30, which is a long one. In section 31 however there are some changes. In line 35 on page 21 between the words "be" and "liable" are added these words, "guilty of an offence against this act and," which of course is a very proper addition. The same addition is made in line 47 between the words "shall" and "for." In subsection 3 of section 31, after the word "shall" in the eighth line and before the word "for" are added the same words.