

countries—this, I think, is what the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth is suggesting—because surely reciprocity is the most important aspect. If we are to have an unemployment insurance scheme which becomes part of the West German scheme, we must have a reciprocal agreement. This, of course, would be true of all countries.

Another possibility would be that we could repeal section 45 of the act and make the benefit payable to residents of all countries who have sufficient Canadian credits to qualify, whether or not they are Canadian citizens. Another possibility would be for us to eliminate coverage for those persons identified in section 52, or we could provide for the payment of sickness and maternity benefits to persons living in foreign countries, provided they otherwise qualify.

Now I would like to say a few words about reciprocal arrangements, which are a little more complex than the hon. member would imply. For example, a reciprocal agreement with a foreign country could consist of several alternatives. The Unemployment Insurance Commission could pay benefits to persons who have established eligibility, according to the Unemployment Insurance Act, while employed in Canada and have gone to a foreign country with the intention of seeking employment in that country. The other country could pay unemployment insurance benefits to persons who established the right to benefits while employed in that country and then came to Canada, or Canada could pay benefits to persons who immigrate to Canada from a foreign country who are unable to find suitable employment on arrival and who have built up unemployment insurance credits in their country. Another possibility would be for the other country to pay benefits to persons who have obtained unemployment insurance credits in Canada, who went to the foreign country and were unable to find suitable employment upon arrival.

At the moment Canada does not entertain reciprocal arrangements with any other jurisdiction except the United States. To enter into such reciprocal agreements with foreign governments would have serious implications which, of course, we would want to consider. In fact, Canada has been approached by both the United Kingdom and Italy to enter into reciprocal arrangements with the Canadian Unemployment Insurance Commission. Essentially, the proposal of the United Kingdom advocated that both countries recognize contributions under the unemployment insurance plan of the other country for the purpose of rates and duration, and the country where the claimant was residing and unable to find employment would pay him unemployment insurance benefits. In the negotiations, the commission indicated that they were not prepared at that time to enter into a reciprocal agreement which would require the commission to recognize the United Kingdom contributions as a qualification for receiving benefits from the Canadian unemployment insurance plan. Part of the rationale for this position—I am sure the hon. member would agree with this—was that the traffic is mainly one way; most people come from the United Kingdom to Canada looking for work.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order.

Unemployment Insurance

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member cannot raise a point of order unless he is seated in his own place.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, when I was making the various points I was not referring to reciprocal arrangements with the United States, the United Kingdom or any other country. The simple point I made was that the government was deducting unemployment insurance from someone from whom it should not be deducted; that is all.

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to rise on the point of order. The House is not considering the hon. member's words, although we listened to his words with great interest, but the motion which is before us; and the motion is not as limited as the speech was. Therefore I would argue that the comments which the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Stollery) was making are very much in order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member will admit that all these points are not points of order but, rather points of debate, I do not think the hon. member was straying from the motion before us, and I think he should be allowed to continue.

Mr. Stollery: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to try to respond to the hon. member's speech. I can only respond to the motion, and I am afraid that is a limitation I must accept in pointing out the error of his ways. I was explaining that the rationale for the position that the Unemployment Insurance Commission is not prepared to enter into an agreement with the government of the United Kingdom is that most people come from the United Kingdom to Canada. This would work to the detriment of Canada. People would be able to come from the United Kingdom to Canada, become eligible for unemployment insurance and then return to the United Kingdom and collect unemployment insurance there after eight weeks' of work in Canada. I think people would find that objectionable.

Another central issue was the fact that there would be difficulty in administering any such agreement, and the effective administration that would be required would be very expensive. Also, it was felt that the difference in currencies would cause a problem. I might add that the commission's views have been fairly well received and the United Kingdom has not pursued this position very strongly.

With regard to the government of Italy, they have approached the Unemployment Insurance Commission with a view to establishing—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo-Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Kempling), not so much for the logic of his motion—although he is usually a logical fellow—but for going to bat for his constituency as a good member should. After all, what he is doing is trying to