

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

I strongly support the sponsor of this resolution. I know that he may have a greater chance to have it passed than if it came from this side of the house. Such a measure is a must today and the farm help must necessarily be covered, either by the Unemployment Insurance Act, or by another legislative measure that parliament will pass. If it is not possible to have the farm people, the farm labourers, benefit from this act, it might be advisable to pass another act which would allow the employers and the farm labourers to benefit from it.

As the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Vincent) stated in his speech, farmers are having a hard time finding workers who would help them during sowing time or during the harvest because they do not give unemployment stamps. Not only are farmers denied that privilege but under the present provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act, they are denied benefits when they help a neighbour build a barn or improve his farm buildings.

But in 1957, farming conditions were not what they are today. And some people are aware of how hard it is in certain parts of the country to make both ends meet for those who are engaged in farming or breeding. This is the reason why it is more imperative than ever before to amend this act so that employees can benefit from that liberal legislation.

**An hon. Member:** A liberal legislation adopted by a Liberal government.

**Mr. Legare:** I am not going to repeat it, even though I am inclined to do so, because our friends in the right hand corner opposite forget too easily the legislation which was introduced by the Liberal party which was so advantageous to the whole of Canada.

I will conclude my remarks because I am sure other hon. members will want to express their opinion. Indeed, I should not want to prevent the house from adopting this resolution which I fully endorse.

**Mr. J. P. Cook (Montmagny-L'Islet):** First of all, I should like to reassure hon. members and tell them that I do not intend to talk out the motion. Even if I did, it would not much matter, because it will die in one way or another at six o'clock, as it has become a custom here to bury every motion at six o'clock.

Before being called to order, Mr. Speaker, I would add that the first thing which should be amended would be standing orders so that

[Mr. Legare.]

a vote be mandatory for all motions, particularly when they are as logical as this one.

Mr. Speaker, if I attempt to say a few words on this motion, it is because I myself have one on the order paper, under No. 44, which is very similar to this one. Unfortunately, as I am not sure that this parliament will live long enough to let us discuss order No. 44, I might say a few words on order No. 13.

I must commend my hon. colleague from Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Rapp) as the promoter of this motion. When listening just now to the eloquent statements made by my colleagues from the Liberal party on the motion, I was quite surprised. I do think they are sincere, but I wonder whether they are really aware of their party's basic policy. Indeed, if this legislation now calls for so many adjustments, we must not forget, as my hon. Liberal colleague said a moment ago, that it was introduced by the Liberal party. Consequently, if we had had a better administration in this country during the 22 years that party was in power, there would have been no need to enact legislation with regard to unemployment insurance, because all classes of society would have had enough work not to have to resort to such insurance.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this motion, which has already been introduced several times by the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale, has not been taken into consideration by the Liberal party when it was in power.

If the Liberal supporters believe today that this motion is sound, why did the Liberal party not consider it when it had the chance to pass it and to make the legislation more accessible to all?

There are in my riding—as elsewhere throughout the province and the country—small farms which yield enough, not to say barely enough, to make a living, or hardly enough to subsist. And, in order to survive on their farms, these farmers cannot afford to hire workers but must turn to their own sons for assistance. However, their sons—like those from all the other working classes in the country—would rather like to work for money and to receive unemployment insurance benefits when they are out of work, and that is impossible under the act as it now stands.