

Unemployment Insurance

as he has held a copy in his hand and has purported to read from it, but he should not be allowed to make these twisted statements in portraying what I actually said.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member is quoting he should give the reference and should of course use the exact words. I think the point is well taken in this regard. There has been some doubt when the hon. member was quoting and when he was not quoting.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I hope I have quoted the exact wording. I did not indicate where I was quoting when I commenced, but I am sure the hon. member will have little difficulty in finding his remarks. They appear at page 4518 of *Hansard* for May 8, 1961.

I was commenting on his statement—

Mr. Drysdale: You should say "I am quoting"—

Mr. Peters: I am not quoting. Mr. Speaker, I will use the quotation again. It appears in *Hansard* at page 4518 as I have indicated. He is reported there as saying:

Among those contributing to its payments would then be persons in receipt of old age pensions and elderly people who could not possibly receive any benefit from the fund and who therefore, I submit have no reason to be paying into it.

What he is saying is that if an individual is receiving the old age pension, that individual should not be working. However, I suggest that an individual who is working, whether receiving the old age pension or not, must make contributions to this fund by law, and having made contributions, is entitled to receive the benefit. I do not feel that the old age pension has any relation to the unemployment insurance fund. Old age pensions are social benefits given to individuals who have reached the age of 70 years regardless of whether or not they are capable of working.

The hon. member then is reported as follows:

I submit that we have to amend the act in such a way as to protect those who need protection and provide for them for as long as they need such assistance without regard to the number of contributions they have made to the fund.

I do not understand that statement at all. The hon. member suggests that we should not relate the benefit period to the amount of contribution. In that event any Tom, Dick or Harry, such as a young chap out of school who works for perhaps one week and then not again for the rest of his life would be able to benefit under this fund even though he has made no further contribution to it. Is that what the hon. member is suggesting? If it is, I think it is a ridiculous suggestion. If this is what is meant by amendments proposed to this act we will be here

[Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

much later than June or July because I will never agree to that type of change.

Mr. Drysdale: You are limited by the rules.

Mr. Peters: I am well aware what the rules and privileges are.

I would like to read one further statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, as reported at page 4518 of *Hansard* in the second column. That statement reads as follows:

However, I do believe there are many married women drawing money out of the fund who have absolutely no need to do so. It is very difficult to establish whether or not married women are actually looking for jobs. This is one of the things, which in my view, is helping to drain the fund. Certainly, it is beyond the ability of government to control this practice by way of administration; an amendment of the act is required in order to deal with things of this nature.

The fact that a woman is married or not seems to me, and apparently as well to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Starr), not to be the criterion governing whether the individual should or should not draw from the unemployment insurance fund. The hon. member would have been well advised to have listened to the Minister of Labour this afternoon. If he had I am sure he would have taken the opportunity of correcting his misinterpretation. I say that presuming that he purported to speak on behalf of the party with which he is associated.

The minister said this afternoon that the act was changed in such a way as to give equality to women, and that this government would not discriminate against women in respect of the benefits of the fund. The minister is to be congratulated on making that very fair and welcome commitment this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, before the recess I had been commenting on some of the suggestions made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Browne) to solve the problems respecting the unemployment insurance fund. In that regard I should like to quote what the hon. member had to say in concluding his speech. As found on page 4521 of *Hansard*, he said:

It is no use condemning perpetually. They always seem to be against something.

He was speaking of the official opposition.

I have not heard a helpful suggestion come from them during the whole time I have been here.