

Unemployment Insurance

The suggestions to which I have referred are not the only suggestions which the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway made. It would appear to me that the hon. member had done considerable research and that he might even have consulted with the Minister of Labour before taking part in the debate. I should like to know whether the government approves the suggestion. The hon. member goes on to say:

There are some groups, such as civil servants, who are not included under the act. I believe they should be.

I have already pointed out that this was the consensus of opinion among many members of the Conservative party on the industrial relations committee when the act was revised on an earlier occasion. The hon. member continues:

The provinces can use their discretion as to which of their employees shall be subject to the provisions of the act and, of course, they follow the policy of insuring those people who are temporary employees and who are almost certain to draw benefit at one time or another. I feel, therefore, that these classes of employees are not bearing their share of the cost of unemployment insurance.

Well, if they are not, the hon. member should report them to the commission and I am sure they will cease to get the benefits.

Mr. Thrasher: The hon. member has completely missed the point.

Mr. Peters: You cannot sort them out, and the hon. member is either talking from ignorance of the situation or he is talking out of both sides of his mouth in discussing civil servants and their position with regard to the fund. If they are all going to be in it, that is okay. That is the suggestion the hon. member makes. But if he is going to suggest that we should let the temporary ones be permanent and still not draw benefits, then I think even his colleagues would disagree with him.

Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been quoting from the remarks I made in this debate, taking them out of context and completely misinterpreting them. Now they are becoming confused with the comments which the hon. member himself is making. I think he should be required to make his own speech.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member thinks he is being misinterpreted I will give him an opportunity to speak later on.

Mr. Peters: Well, this speech lends itself to misinterpretation. I hope I am not doing that—

An hon. Member: Make your own speech.

Mr. Peters: It is more fun rehashing this one, because these are new ideas and they are ideas which are being put forward by a backbencher in the Conservative party. I should like to know what is the position of the government with regard to them. Is the government going to adopt these views, or throw them out? Many of them, I submit, should be thrown out but some of them may be of consequence and deserving of consideration by the government. It is for this reason I wish to refer to them.

Mr. Broome: Why not try to put forward some constructive ideas, too?

Mr. Peters: I presume that in discussing these matters we are raising constructive arguments. They are either worthy of some consideration or of no consideration. If they warrant no consideration, then, in bringing them to the attention of the house, we are helping to make sure that that is exactly what they will get. If they warrant some constructive consideration, they may receive that also. The hon. member goes on to say:

If the federal government is going to contribute huge sums to the unemployment insurance fund, as they suggest, we would be taking the money out of general taxation. Among those contributing to its payment 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.

If they are paying into the fund apparently they are employed, and because they are receiving an old age pension they should not be prevented from receiving the benefits. Presumably they are receiving the old age pension because they have reached the age of 70.

Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member should not be permitted to twist my words as he has been doing since he started.

Mr. Speaker: I take it the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) is referring to the viewpoint expressed by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Browne) and endeavouring to counter that viewpoint in the debate. If he is improperly quoting the hon. member, that would be ground for complaint. However, as I have indicated, the hon. member will have the opportunity of correcting any misinterpretation of his speech, to which he takes exception, at the end of the hon. member's remarks.

Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway): If the hon. member wishes to quote my remarks from *Hansard* and gives the reference, I have no objection, but I do not believe he should be allowed to give his interpretation of what I said and use that for his own purposes. I presume he has been quoting from *Hansard*,