

*Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971*

However, I now think like the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants, that teachers are experiencing the same insecurity, although maybe to a lesser degree, as the people now covered by unemployment insurance. Teachers today are coming to realize that they also need unemployment insurance. I foresee the time when even doctors, lawyers and engineers will be glad to come under the umbrella of the community in the form of unemployment insurance. I think the day is coming, and I am glad to see it coming, when they also will be brought under this umbrella. So, I believe that we should provide the widest possible coverage under this legislation.

The argument has been advanced that if teachers are brought under this scheme they will have to gouge school boards for higher salaries so that they can afford to pay unemployment insurance contributions. The school boards, in turn, will have to gouge the public so as to obtain more funds in order to pay the gouging teachers to pay the gouging Unemployment Insurance Commission. I think this is the reddest of red herrings that could be drawn across the trail. If the process of gouging has the effect of making Ottawa realize that it has to divvy up its taxes with the municipalities on the basis of their need, so much to the good. If the municipalities, teachers and other people at the local level need more money, it will be but an additional piece of leverage to get Ottawa to redistribute the taxes that it collects in a much more equitable manner between Ottawa and the municipalities of the country which really need them. If the provincial moneybags find themselves caught in the middle of the process, we shall still have to find a way of bringing the municipalities in on the consultation.

We in this party are thoroughly in favour of this Unemployment Insurance Act as far as it goes. We think that it can be improved. I, for my part, would like to see these improvements given very close attention because they are the product of the experience and the thinking, not only of labour unions across this country but of a great many professional people who are now coming to realize that this is also their scheme. The sooner they are brought in under it, the more secure they will be and the broader and more safe the unemployment insurance scheme will be.

Above all, I want to put in a word for the women in the labour force of this country who now know that one of the great hazards to the security of their homes and their children will be removed. They will now be able to take time out to have their children in an honest and straightforward way, to make arrangements for them and to go back to the labour force, with their seniority and job rights protected—that is, when this legislation is complemented shortly by that under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. So, I feel that the minister deserves a great deal of credit for swimming against the mainstream of his party's policy, which I feel he is doing in this regard.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before the Chair recognizes the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) I should tender apologies to him. The Chair has attempted to alternate

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

speakers during this debate from one side of the House to the other. After the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants had completed his remarks, I proposed to give the floor to the hon. member for Ottawa West, but I am afraid I was mesmerized by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). At present the Chair having presented apologies to the hon. member, will recognize the hon. member for Ottawa West.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Good for you, Sir.

**Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West):** I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that all of us have been mesmerized by the fine speech by the hon. lady who has just spoken. I find myself in substantial agreement with what she said, which is not always the case, but this afternoon I found her remarks to be particularly interesting.

In introducing the debate on second reading, the minister, who is now in his seat, said that the legislation had been drafted on what he said, in a casual way, was the unanimous report of the committee examining the recommendations in the white paper. The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) then rose and said it was not quite an unanimous report but rather one that was adopted on division. I think the debate has shown the extent to which there has been agreement coming from the committee. I was one of those who attended most of the committee's sittings. We heard a number of very forthright briefs attacking the principle of the legislation and the basic features proposed in it. But I suggest that anyone reviewing the *Hansard* record of this debate and reading the speeches of the hon. member for Hamilton West, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who are both in this House at present, the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) the leading spokesman for the Creditiste party, and the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Weatherhead) would, I think, be more impressed by the degree of unanimity than by the amount of criticism and difference. There are things that can be done to improve the bill.

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I dislike interrupting the hon. member's fine speech up to this point but in order that the record be clear may I point out that the reason I mentioned that the standing committee's report was not unanimous but was passed on division was that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had indicated earlier, in regard to the Public Accounts Committee, that he did not understand why the opposition was questioning the report of that committee since it was unanimous. Surely, the hon. member would not want me to fall into that trap. This was the reason I pointed out the lack of unanimity, and the minister then expressed his regrets for having indicated that it was a unanimous report when, in fact, it was passed on division.

**Mr. Francis:** I certainly accept the hon. member's remarks. All I was trying to do was to indicate the