

have been given the opportunity to get this bill through today.

I hope I have not missed any point that is of great concern to an hon. member. The matter of the eight weeks has bothered some members. Others have asked why we should adopt the two-week period instead of a period of 10 weeks, 12 weeks or 14 weeks. I must say that this is a matter of judgment. We have not had a chance to talk about it thoroughly here, but we assume that the eight weeks will indicate some attachment to the work force. Everything will be done through claimant services to get people back to work sooner. We have set up test projects in Hamilton and other cities and find we are getting people back to work a week or ten days earlier than previously.

Having regard to the three-week lump sum, I think upon reflection we will probably divide this into two payments within a period of five weeks. I must remind hon. members, in conclusion that the two-week waiting period is a substantial deterrent against abuse. Two weeks waiting period plus three weeks at \$100 would mean that one would draw \$300 and today one would wait one week and would draw four weeks benefit, or \$200 and some odd.

● (6:00 p.m.)

The second thing is, I must remind members that we have eliminated many of the sources of abuse in respect of seasonal benefits. The fact that we are making the unemployment insurance benefits taxable will certainly be a disincentive to those who have attempted to use the fund by living on unemployment insurance during the winter months when conceivably they could find work.

In respect of merit rating, I can only suggest to members of the House who want a good in depth explanation of merit rating and why I believe it is logical and valid that they might read the speech of the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), at least that part of the speech where he was honest in his approach and not trying to be politically expedient and all things to all people. At least in respect of merit rating, he expressed his true philosophy as did the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) today who indicated that merit rating will penalize, if you want to use that word, certain industries which in the past have taken advantage of unemployment insurance to subsidize their work force, keeping it immobile and having it ready, willing and able to work whenever the need is felt.

I am thinking particularly of the construction industry. I have no apologies at all for the construction industry.

Business of the House

Upon reflection, it is one which lobbies at every opportunity in this House of Commons against hours, against wages and against various standards. I do my best to accommodate them. I am not unaware of the problems they have and I also am not unaware of the fact that merit rating conceivably could place an added burden on the employers in the construction industry, but since merit rating is not to come in until 1974, 1975 and 1976 there will be ample opportunity in the interval to sit down with recognized employer groups to work out a suitable method of merit rating. We may possibly consider merit rating a construction firm against a construction industry, measuring its performance against the experience of other people in that particular industry rather than industry in depth. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the House for its courtesy.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, before you see that the clock is slightly in the vicinity of six o'clock, I wonder if I could ask the Parliamentary Secretary if he would confirm the arrangement I made with the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) that tomorrow we will deal with the Yukon Minerals Bill.

Mr. Jerome: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. We propose to call, as the first order of government business tomorrow, the Yukon Minerals Bill and presumably there would be further discussion tomorrow concerning whether we would continue with that item on Friday or go on to the legislation in respect of the Labour Standards Code.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow. I take this opportunity to wish hon. members a very quiet, enjoyable evening and a good night's sleep. I remind them that such benefits are not guaranteed by any paid insurance scheme.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.