

The question, therefore, is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, we have returned now to the debate on third reading of the bill after what I think is an unfortunate lack of appreciation by hon. members of the advantages of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It is my hope, coming as I do from a depressed area in Canada, that further changes will be made to the bill.

It is odd that one can call part of Ontario a depressed area, because most people think the province has no problems. Nevertheless, in northern Ontario, in particular, unemployment insurance is very important to sections of the population which the government does not wish to support, namely, the class of people who are attached to the labour force in a limited way, not because that is their wish but because of the area in which they live. This is true, of course, of other areas of Canada. I was pleased to see that one or two members recognized their responsibility with regard to those areas and did something about it to bring about changes. To be fair to them, other hon. members may have no problem in this regard. It is probably a fact that many people with short-term attachment to the labour force are to be found in a large area of Canada, but not in a large number of ridings; therefore, the matter is of small concern to some.

We have contended during the debate on this bill that one part of it is excellent and another part deserves further study. That is the part to which we are very much opposed. It does not warrant our support. I am referring to the section of the act which would merge the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Manpower job placement officers of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. It is bad enough that many hon. members are not interested in the unemployment rate in Canada, but at least they could sit here quietly. I would appreciate it if they would leave, go on holiday, or do whatever they want.

Mr. Baldwin: Where could we get better entertainment than this?

Mr. Peters: I would appreciate it if they took themselves off somewhere else, because I intend to speak until one o'clock and also later today on this section of the act. Also, I intend to move an amendment, after which there will be a vote, and another vote after that. So if these members are just waiting around here for something to happen, it will not happen and they might as well go for lunch. I certainly would encourage them to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. There appear to be a lot of conversations. I suggest that hon. members wishing to carry on conversations go behind the curtains, into the lobby.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your assistance. As the hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Jones)

Employment and Immigration

suggests, I will start over again. I may do just that, Mr. Speaker, and again and again. Nobody will be able to detect whether or not this is in order, with all the hubbub that is going on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Peters: I was opposed in the first place to separating the unemployment section of the department from the employment section or job placement agency. Unlike the Conservatives, I am not too happy with the job placement agency in Canada—and that goes back to the time when I was a young lad looking for my first job. In those days one had to buy a job. Since I was too poor to buy a job, I had to get it another way, although it really was not very different. Seeing that everybody is so interested in what I have to say, and it is such a pleasant afternoon, I will be pleased to tell the House about it. When I went to look for a job, the logical place in northern Ontario to do so was in the mining industry. I accompanied my father to Timiskaming and I went to the job placement agency. In those days the job placement agency was a private company run by a one-armed bandit.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: That was literally the case. You had to pay, because that was how they operated. The government did not assist you in finding employment in those days. You made your payment. I do not know exactly what it was, but I gave him quite a story. I told him that I had come out of the bush—I had been working in the bush before Christmas, and this was around February—that I had been staying in a hotel and had a big bill to pay, that I owed the restaurant for meals and was pretty hard up. I said to him that I would certainly appreciate his help. He was kind enough to send me to one of the smaller mines, the last mine on the back road where the drifters went. Prior to that I had been to another mine. I knew the brother of the superintendent at that mine fairly well. I went to the bunkhouse and was interviewed, and I left without a job because the price of the job was a bottle of Black and White scotch every payday. I understand the superintendent collected that from almost everyone he hired. He lived for many years, and he died of an ailment of the liver. However, it took many years and many employees before that happened. I am sure other hon. members remember the depression and could tell similar stories about how jobs were obtained. Some of their stories might be better than mine. I was an employer before I started to work in the mines.

● (1230)

Mr. Trudel: Now it comes out.

Mr. Rodriguez: Free enterprise capitalist.

Mr. Peters: I was an employer in a very small way. My father worked for the government. He was away most of the time and left a younger brother and me to run the farm. We had to hire people to help on the farm. I heard some fairly good sob stories which probably were true. Those stories