

Unemployment Assistance

but, sir, that is what could happen under this bill as it is presently constituted.

Much has been made of the question of length of residence. The minister answers that by saying that length of residence does not enter into the question at all, but it clearly does.

To begin with I am going to ask the minister to explain why the draft agreement should not be attached as an appendix to this act. There is no reason whatsoever why this act should be as wide open as it now is to the interpretation that might be placed thereon by the minister at any time in order to achieve the consent of any province now outside the act. Whilst I am sure the minister would never allow political considerations to enter into his administration of this act, as it now stands he could do so. I never believed he would until the concluding words of his remarks on second reading. Those concluding remarks were not in keeping with the usually detached attitude the minister takes, except when he rises to those heights of eloquence when he forgets that this is the House of Commons and treats us as though we were individuals in an audience and he was on the political stump.

Mr. Martin: I am afraid that is a frailty my hon. friend and I share.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is one thing I do not share with my hon. friend, but it is a frank admission on his part—and he speaks for himself in that regard—that he does so on occasion. This apparently is one of those occasions when he allows himself to be carried away by generalizations regarding the meritorious nature of this and other pieces of legislation to which he made reference—that is, meritorious in his opinion.

I ask the minister first why the draft agreement is not attached hereto. There is no reason whatsoever why it should not be attached. In no way is it connected with the draft agreement which appeared in *Hansard* of January 11 at page 25; and the draft agreement as submitted to Nova Scotia is at page 27. I suggest first that in order to make this bill effective that draft agreement should be attached hereto, to set out in detail many of the items which at the moment are not covered by the bill and which to all intents and purposes, to use a colloquialism, are left up in the air.

I suggest that in order to better this bill, first these agreements should be attached. Otherwise in the preparation of the regulations the minister will be in a position—for after all he will prepare the regulations, irrespective of whether or not the governor in

council has anything to do with that—to prepare them in such a general way that whatever measure he chooses will be in keeping with the provisions of the act.

We know what happened under the disability pensions act. That act was passed by this house—a very desirable objective to be attained—but when the regulations were brought in and parliament had no opportunity to consider those regulations, the result was that many thousands of people across Canada had been denied disability pensions because of the narrow definition that had been incorporated into the regulations. The minister has said on occasion that such interpretation was based on consultation between the dominion and the provinces, but that does not meet the criticism I have in mind.

As this bill stands today it is a mass of generalizations; indeed a hodge-podge of generalizations. It fails to bind the minister or the government in any way to carry out agreements similar to the draft agreement that is set out in *Hansard* of January 11. It leaves everything wide open. It makes it possible for the government by negotiation to enter into an agreement far different from the agreement of January 11, for the limitations under the bill as it now stands are not the limitations set out in the draft agreement to which I have already made reference.

I say first that unless this bill is intended when enacted to empower the minister and the government to enter into new kinds of agreements, expanded agreements, with the governments that so far have not indicated their acquiescence or desire to enter into agreement, then in order to ensure equality among all the provinces of Canada outside of Nova Scotia there should be the inclusion of the general draft agreement as an appendix to the bill.

Then we have another question that has been raised before but has not been answered satisfactorily by the minister. He answered it in that kindly way he has when he wishes to brush aside any criticism. When he wishes to get an item through he becomes the essence of urbanity. However, he has told my friend the hon. member for Saskatoon that there is no residence requirement. Let us read section 5 of the draft agreement and see what it says. Section 5 reads as follows:

5. Length of residence shall not be made a condition for the receipt of assistance if—

I may say that reference was made to the same point by another hon. member.

Mr. Martin: The hon. member for Hamilton West.