

Unemployment Insurance

proper way of dealing with this situation so long as there is abnormal unemployment. We, therefore, intend to vote for this sub-amendment.

I am not saying that nearly all the administration—

An hon. Member: Are you for Douglas or for Argue?

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps I could let this debate behind me go on for a minute or so.

Mr. Pearson: Why do they not keep order?

Mr. Peters: Why does not the hon. member rise in his place and make a speech?

Mr. Lambert: If I did so, I would treat the subject a little bit more logically.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate has the floor and I would ask all hon. members to please allow him to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. Pickersgill: I was saying that it seems to me quite important that we should take action and do so promptly and that this house should be given adequate time in which to consider the proposals of the government with respect to the replenishment of this fund and with respect to these abuses that hon. gentlemen opposite now assert they find in the administration of the act. Indeed, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway himself said that the act now was in such a mess it could not be enforced by anybody. I suggest that we should have these amendments before us at once.

Hon. gentlemen complain about the lack of suggestions from the opposition; that has been a constant refrain. They complain about lack of suggestions from the opposition. There has been no lack of suggestions from the opposition either about this matter—a good many have been made right in this debate—or about the problem of unemployment about which the minister spoke. The minister referred to these measures and I remind the minister, since he referred to them first, that the vocational training proposals which were brought in last November were recommended by my friend the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) in 1958.

Mr. Starr: I was not allowed to speak about them.

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister says he was not allowed to speak about them.

Mr. Starr: Not about those things.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am confining myself to points raised by the minister and am raising no new matter whatsoever. The minister says

the government received no suggestions from the opposition. Rather than give my views which some might regard as partial or biased I should like to read from the revised Canadian Annual Review for 1960, a publication which we have missed since 1939 and which all of us should be happy to see revived again because it is obviously a great contribution to our knowledge of affairs in this country. I should like to read from the Canadian Annual Review's summary on this very question of suggestions—and that is what makes it relevant—what the *Globe and Mail* said. They quote from the *Globe and Mail*.

An hon. Member: What is the page number?

Mr. Pickersgill: It is on page 20 of this volume. The *Globe and Mail* of August 12, 1960 said:

It might have been assumed that the Diefenbaker government, with its huge majority, would have guided and controlled the proceedings in parliament. It did nothing of the kind. Instead, the initiative rested throughout with the opposition and the private members... In all the debates too, it was the opposition speakers who seemed to have most of the ideas. The cabinet provided little leadership. Its members gave the impression of men baffled by the problems which confronted them, unsure of their course, anxious to put off action in the hope that something would turn up.

Mr. Ricard: Who wrote that? A friend of yours?

Mr. Pickersgill: As far as the Unemployment Insurance Act is concerned, nothing has yet turned up.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this afternoon of speaking on this amendment of welcoming the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) back to the house and of expressing the hope that he has something to say on this important matter. It seems to me that this is the fifth or sixth time that we have discussed this matter of unemployment either in this manner or in others. Yet we are continually hearing the charge that the opposition has nothing further to offer. The reason this happens I believe is simply explained. It was explained quite simply by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Browne) last night and I should like to refer to that matter. But before doing so, I should like to say what we think about the fund itself.

We in the C.C.F. believe, as our amendment states, that the fund itself is an insurance fund set up and contributed to by the employee through his contribution and through the wage factor that is a contribution of the employer. We believe that the government assumed the responsibility of administering the fund and also of making