

found she must be resident in Canada in order to collect unemployment insurance.

It is not uncommon for persons, having contributed to the unemployment insurance fund for a number of years, to feel entitled to collect at least their contributions or a specific amount of money. We do this for people who upon reaching age 65 apply for a pension. They are directed to the UIC by Manpower and told they can collect three weeks' benefits. In the case of my constituents, who had contributed for a period of 12 years, she felt she was entitled to collect some of her contribution. She wrote to the UIC and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) but received little satisfaction. For that reason I put the notice of motion on the order paper. I think it would be appropriate for me to read into the record the letter my constituent wrote the Prime Minister on December 14, 1972. She said, if I may be allowed to quote:

Dear Sir:

Being so far away from home, we Canadians overseas seem to lose all contacts with our government and its policies. The following incident with which I have been faced has made me wonder what "A Just Society" really is. Our government has so often used this term over the last few years and I must say that I truly believed they intended to implement this policy. However, the situation in which I was personally involved has raised doubts in my mind.

My husband is a member of the Canadian armed forces and last July was transferred to CFB Europe. Before our departure for Europe, I inquired through the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Quebec City as to my entitlement to unemployment insurance since I had to resign from my position due to my husband's transfer. I had, up to this date, worked for 12 years in Canada and had therefore been paying unemployment insurance for all those years without, at any time, collecting any unemployment insurance. I was advised that because I would not be a resident of Canada, I was not entitled to any benefits. I found this quite unfair since the government of Canada was my husband's employer and the government was the party sending my husband to Europe. He was not coming to Europe for a trip or holiday but to work here as a Canadian, as a member of the Canadian armed forces on a Canadian base. But I was formally told that I had no right to any benefits. Who is really entitled to Canadian benefits? I have known many wives and mothers back in Canada who went to work for a period of time and then resigned purposely because, as they would quote, "It pays a lot more to stay home and collect unemployment insurance than to work all the time." Is this what you call "just"? After 12 years of continuous work and paying unemployment insurance, I am refused a benefit and yet a person who goes to work for one year with the idea that after this period she will resign and stay home collecting unemployment insurance.

However, I left Canada and although I was not in agreement with this policy, there was nothing I could do about it. After I arrived here, I went to work at CFB Europe for a short period but had to resign because of my child. When I received my pay, I noticed that Canadian income tax and pension were deducted from my pay. This seemed strange to me after being told in Canada that I was not considered to be a resident of Canada, but I was truly shocked to notice that unemployment insurance dues were indeed deducted from my pay. The government was not willing to consider me for benefits here but they were most willing to enrich their treasury with all those deductions.

She went on to make a few other remarks which I do not think would be appropriate to read into the record. I read this letter with a great deal of interest. My only purpose in putting this matter on the order paper was to try to clarify what I consider to be an injustice. I have checked the matter with the Unemployment Insurance Commission and find that indeed you receive no benefits for your contributions while outside Canada; but on return to

Unemployment Insurance

Canada, after waiting for a period of eight weeks you can collect benefits. This in no way relates to the fact that you were employed and contributing outside the country.

I believe it would be unreasonable to expect the government to pay unemployment insurance benefits to people employed outside Canada, as I do not think you could control this situation. I am prepared to accept that fact. But surely it is just as unreasonable and unjust to ask a person employed outside Canada to contribute to the unemployment insurance fund with the full knowledge that they cannot collect benefits because they are not resident in Canada. The clear solution seems to me to be just to stop deducting UIC premiums from persons employed outside Canada who cannot collect benefits because they are not resident in Canada.

That is about the sum and substance of what I have to say on the subject. This is something the government could rectify by regulation. I do not think it is political in any way, shape or form, but I think it is an injustice. I do not suggest it was done deliberately, but was perhaps an oversight on the part of the government and the commission. I cannot help but feel my constituent has a just case. She has every right to be heard, and when she could not get satisfaction from other avenues of approach she wrote me. I have taken this opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the Parliament of Canada in the hope that the department or the parliamentary secretary will convey this injustice to the minister, an injustice which I believe should be rectified.

Mr. Peter Stollery (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to comment on the case the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) has brought to our attention. I should like to remind him that the unemployment insurance scheme is an insurance scheme. If you owned an automobile and paid insurance on it for ten years, and at the end of that period sold it and swore that you would never again own an automobile, the insurance company would not give you back your insurance money.

The motion before the House suggests that the government should consider the advisability of amending the Unemployment Insurance Act to remove the inequity whereby a contributor, who is not resident in Canada, cannot receive benefits upon becoming unemployed outside the country, and in fact receives no benefit from these contributions upon returning to Canada.

I should like to point out various aspects of the motion. I think the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth in his comments said that the person who comes back to Canada can indeed collect some insurance, but I should like to point out and emphasize that it is clear that the premise of the motion is partly unfounded in another aspect and it is really quite untrue, as the hon. member himself has pointed out. I wish to deal first with the inaccuracy. The motion states that an unemployed person who has become unemployed outside Canada cannot receive benefits from unemployment insurance even upon returning to this country. This part of his motion is inaccurate.