

children, and anybody else's children for that matter, are taught to be the best type of citizens in today's rapidly changing world. I do not think there can be that much security, that much ossification, in any profession. I could talk about my own profession of the law, or even of medicine, but I shall confine myself to the teachers, and because I mention them by name I hope that no one will misunderstand. I am dealing really with the rapid changes in society and what I think our attitude to society should be.

One year ago I think I would have resisted the proposal of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) to put teachers within the concept of universality, but I do not do so today. I do not do so because I know that hundreds of teachers in Nova Scotia will be thrown out of work, as doubtless they will in other parts of Canada as well. I have to think of these people. In doing so, I take the risk that the 90 per cent who will not suffer unemployment will frown on me for what I say; but somebody has to work and fight for minorities, and this is what I am proposing to do.

The ironic thing is that because the minister is introducing universality, and including the teachers within the terms of this act, some unemployment of teachers will result. In short, the municipalities of Canada will have to raise taxes in order to pay their share of unemployment insurance premiums for their teachers. Municipal taxation being what it is today, the more taxes the municipalities raise the more they will have to compress their budgets in other respects. This in turn means that somewhere along the line more teachers will be knocked off the payroll. As I say, this is one of the ironic but immediate results of the minister's policy. Nonetheless, on balance I think we have to support it, and unless there is some very compelling evidence to the contrary given to the committee that is to study this bill, on third reading I shall certainly support the principle of universality for teachers.

The second matter I wish to refer to is one with regard to which I would ask the Minister of Labour's co-operation in adding his thoughts to my own. It is a matter that I have not studied in depth as I should but which came to my mind a few days ago. I have informally scouted it with the minister, and perhaps because of the special role that I have within the ranks of my party in this Parliament it made a greater impression on me. I refer to whether unemployment insurance should be extended to some of the inmates of federal penitentiaries in Canada. I have uttered what to some is a fantastic proposition, one that most people would regard as absurd—not irrelevant, but at least absurd. However, I think the suggestion demands a public airing, and I should like to pursue it for a moment or two before terminating my contribution to this debate.

When the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs visits certain federal penitentiaries, its members are always taken to the workshops and made well aware that within these institutions there are hundreds of men and some women who are given specialized training each year as mechanics, tailors, barbers and the like. It seems

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971

to me that surely we can devise some sort of formula to bring them within the operations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I do not know how this can be done. Perhaps this proposal has never been set down on paper. But I hope that both the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the people who are charged with the responsibility for correctional services in Canada will give some thought to the proposal so that when the bill is before the committee they can say whether the idea is or is not feasible.

● (3:10 p.m.)

I should like to give the House some idea of the numbers involved here. I quote these figures from page 58 of the Annual Report of the Solicitor General of Canada 1969/1970. In that fiscal year—it is called a fiscal year rather than a penitential year—those on the registers of federal institutions in Canada, of which institutions there would be a little more than two dozen, totalled 7,009 males and 109 females, for a total population as of April 1, 1969 of 7,118. Of those, 4,180 men and 71 women were admitted during that year. There were 5,860 transfers in and 5,860 transfers out. There were 1,896 males and 35 females who received direct discharges at the expiration of their sentence, and 1,947 males and 45 females who received direct discharges by parole. The total discharges for either expiration of sentence or parole amounted to 3,950 males and 81 females. As of March 31, 1970 the number of inmates registered was 7,239 males and 99 females, so there was an increase of about 200 in the prison population as of that time.

On the basis of these figures, I suggest we would be dealing in terms of unemployment insurance with at least several thousand people. Perhaps all 7,000 would not be getting unemployment insurance as a result of being inmates in a federal penitentiary at one time, but this scheme could cover a fair number of them, thereby providing some relief from the anxieties they face when they come out into the world. The lack of funds is probably a major reason for recidivism; that is the return of a former inmate to his criminal tendencies which gets him back in the penitentiary.

This is not a revolutionary idea. People have thought of this before. I think with a little coaxing the John Howard Society might be tempted to give some advice to the committee and the minister. I am sure the personnel of correctional services in penitentiaries are responsible people. The officials of the Unemployment Insurance Commission must have some ideas in this regard. Members of these bodies, as well as officials of the manpower office, have a responsibility to come forward and present their ideas along this line. These people might be very unpopular if they expressed views in favour of this suggestion, in view of the fact that a few hardened thugs managed to persuade a great number of other people to ransack the Kingston penitentiary. I hope we will not be so emotionally upset by what happened there that we will turn our backs on an idea which makes sense.

Within the penitentiary set-up there is training so that the occupational skills of the inmates can be used. They