

That is not the sort of loose administration which can be countenanced by the unemployment insurance commission or by the government. I suggest that, if he considers all the implications, this scheme will not be countenanced even by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling). Therefore, it seems to me that it would not be advisable to follow the line suggested by this motion. At the same time, it is important to understand that the motion has, albeit erroneously and inaccurately, drawn the matter to our attention. Inasmuch as there is already a considerable area within which there is protection for Canadians who are employed abroad and who make contributions abroad, it would not seem wise at present to expand that protection.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling) has given us an opportunity to go over this general area of concern, even though he has spoken about his constituency. For that I wish to thank him. Without looking beyond our borders, the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth can point to people who fall into two additional categories which might benefit from his intervention in this House. I am speaking of their eligibility for unemployment insurance payments.

First, let me refer to constituents who might presently be or might have been in the past workmen's compensation cases. On re-entering the labour force after absence due to an accident, after which they might have found a new skill, they are confronted with difficulties. Many people acquire new skills in their forties and fifties. Such people as these may have contributed for a number of years to the unemployment insurance scheme. They find themselves attempting to re-enter the labour force. They seek employment and yet are without protection; they are without income benefits on a weekly basis, and without the advantage of protection under the unemployment insurance scheme. This category would embrace a number of people in the hon. member's constituency and in the constituencies of many members of this House.

Another group affected, of course, is the group alluded to by the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth. Perhaps the government should look at this matter and try to find an equitable answer. This group consists of ex-inmates who have been out of the labour force, for obvious reasons. They may have contributed considerably and, at a certain point, found themselves re-entering the labour force; yet because of their absence from the labour force, they do not qualify for any benefit or coverage.

That situation, of course, entails an economic strain on those individuals who are, in most cases, seriously determined to re-enter society and find employment in a normal way, just as everybody else does. Yet they must turn to special agencies for economic assistance instead of drawing benefits from the fund that has been established, also with their help.

We can understand the dilemma of the commission in being asked to cover people who have been out of the labour force for a certain period. In the case of the man who has been injured and who has been covered for some time by workmen's compensation, the unemployment insurance commission can say that such a man has not been available for work, has been under the jurisdiction of

Capital Punishment

another commission, and therefore constitutes a case for which the commission has no responsibility. I suppose a similar reply could be made by the commission in the case of an ex-inmate.

The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth, in giving examples, raised the question of the eligibility of individuals in our society who, for some reason or other, have not belonged to the labour force in Canada for some time but who, at the same time, feel that they have a claim on some form of benefit.

This raises a much broader question. I would not want to incur your displeasure or be ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker, but I am looking at the clock, and it is almost six o'clock. In other words, we must deal with the much broader question of whether in modern times the whole system of unemployment insurance really meets our needs, or whether or not in Canada we should introduce a system which will be based on ensuring employment rather than on ensuring benefits for the unemployed.

The present system of unemployment insurance entails the setting up of all sorts of rules and regulations that result in frustrations and confrontations between applicants and claimants, on the one side, and the bureaucracy, on the other, with the government getting the blame in the middle. Mr. Speaker, as it is six o'clock, perhaps I may be permitted to call it so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock tonight.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

REINSTATEMENT OF LAW RELATING TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT THAT EXISTED PRIOR TO DECEMBER 30, 1972

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-2, to amend the Criminal Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, here we go again on the capital punishment debate, Bill C-2. In my view, this debate is a waste of time. Many bills have much greater priority than this. I believe about 150 speeches have been made on this bill since it was introduced earlier this session.

Let me repeat what I stated when I spoke in this debate on May 22. There are many bills, such as the family allowances bill, which could have been debated earlier this