

Unemployment Insurance Act

I support the recommendation made by the committee as against this proposed amendment. The steering committee of the industrial relations committee which went into this matter rather thoroughly recommended that the regulations respecting married women be reviewed to eliminate the additional contribution requirement after the first separation subsequent to marriage. In my judgment if the regulation were amended in that way it would take care of the difficulty which married women experience in establishing unemployment insurance benefits.

While this is only a recommendation by the committee, we were reasonably assured by the minister and the representatives of the commission that the regulation would be amended in that way. I think it is better for us to accept the possibility of getting the main joker out of the picture than to try to force through an amendment which will not be accepted and not get anything done at all.

Mrs. Fairclough: I am sorry the hon. member for Cape Breton South is so pessimistic that he thinks a recommendation made in good faith has no chance at all of passing this committee.

Mr. Gillis: Realistic is the word.

Mrs. Fairclough: I do not know whether realistic is the word. From the time I first came into this house I have supported actions of this sort, and I recall that on many occasions the hon. member for Cape Breton South has done likewise.

Mr. Gillis: And I shall on other occasions.

Mrs. Fairclough: Not only should this discrimination be removed, but there should be nothing in the act to permit the making of a specific regulation against one and only one group of workers. If they were people who had from time to time attempted to make raids on the fund, to use words which have been used previously by the minister and his officials, I could perhaps understand why this particular clause should be in the act, but while there is a rather blithe disregard of attempts made by male workers to procure benefits which the commission term as unjustified, in the case of married women I must ask the committee to support me in my plea for the removal of this discrimination from the act. This is the only class of worker discriminated against in the act, and I submit that the clause should be removed.

Amendment negatived: Yeas, 12; nays, 29.

Mr. Knowles: Can the minister make a positive statement as to the attitude of the commission toward the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. Gregg: Again I cannot make a statement in detail as to exactly what the commission will recommend, but I am assured by the commission that they will study the recommendation. Not only that; they will go over the whole question, because there is no intent whatsoever on the part of the government or of the commission to allow discriminations to exist either in the act or in the regulations.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 68 to 122 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask the minister whether arrangements can be made for a reprinting of the bill at an early date, including the amendments?

Mr. Gregg: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Does my hon. friend mean before third reading?

Mr. Knowles: I would hope so. After all, third reading will not be until sometime next week.

Mr. Gregg: I was rather hoping, by leave of the house, that we might have third reading today. In any case I hope that the bill can be reprinted to cover all the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I think I would be very remiss if I did not acknowledge the very kind words that were said at the opening of the proceedings today. I cannot tell the committee how much I appreciate them. As the discussion went forward today I wished there was room in my bag to put some of the co-operation and good will that has been shown here today, so I could take it to the halls at Geneva.

At this time I should like to state that it is a great honour to represent this parliament at the ILO. Of the many international conferences attended by my colleagues the minister of external affairs and the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the ILO is indeed the senior of all, and the only one that over a period of 36 years has retained its original aims and aspirations, surviving of course through the hospitality of McGill University during the war years. When it was at McGill my predecessor, Mr. Humphrey Mitchell, attended of course as the political head of the Department of Labour in Canada and acted as host. Since that time, on only one occasion has the Minister of Labour attended at Geneva.

Of course, as all members know, in the last three years the standing invitation by