

Unemployment Insurance

Mr. McLARTY: I was just going to refer to that. After all, this is a most important committee. We have heard a good deal said about the actuarial soundness of the scheme, and to keep it sound we must have a most capable advisory committee. In England they obtained the services of a man of the highest type, namely, Sir William Beveridge, to act as chairman of the advisory committee. As will be seen in subsection 3, one representative shall be appointed after consultation with organizations representative of the employed persons, and an equal number after consultation with organizations representative of employers.

It seems to me that perhaps when the measure was first drawn we might have underestimated the importance of the advisory committee, and that is the reason for the present change. However, we do not now underestimate the importance of the advisory committee. It seems to me that probably a person who could be most usefully chairman of such a committee might be a most capable actuary. I feel that we shall not treat it as a haven of refuge, as has been suggested by the leader of the opposition. Rather we would be inclined to obtain the judgment of the soundest and best representative of industry and labour, and one of actuarial attainments, that we can obtain.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So long as subsection 8 remains in the section, there would seem to be no necessity for subsection 4, or even for the suggestion I made about defeated candidates.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): As I pointed out earlier, subsection 8 has been changed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Speaking seriously, if we are to have any benefit from this measure, then we shall have to obtain qualified persons, and pay them properly.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am always afraid of these provisions respecting travelling expenses, unless some limitations are imposed. I have in mind two accounts which were paid—not during this session, but during the life of the present government. One of the gentlemen working on a certain matter came from town X, and he took the longest way round to come to his duties. He could travel in two ways, one short and one long. Another man on the same mission, whose expenses were also being paid by the government, lived some twenty-five miles farther away. However, he

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

travelled the short route and his expenses were less than the man who actually lived twenty-five miles nearer. I do not like to see this travelling expense business left wide open.

Mr. McLARTY: If you put a ceiling on it, it must be high enough to cover a man from Victoria in the west or from Charlottetown in the east. That might prove an encouragement to those who live within a shorter radius to see if they could not keep up with the Jones'.

Mr. NEILL: I do not see why the suggestion of the leader of the opposition cannot be accepted. Subsection 4 states that no senator or member of parliament shall be eligible. However, once a member has been defeated, he is eligible. What halo falls upon him simply because he is a defeated candidate? I think the section ought to read "member or defeated member".

Mr. McLARTY: I suppose all I can do is to refer the hon. member to the Independence of Parliament Act. Once a member has been defeated, he is no longer in a position to influence by his vote in the House of Commons any action of this commission. He is as free and independent a citizen as if he had never been a candidate for parliament.

Mr. NEILL: In one instance, the man has proven himself capable of being elected, in the other he has been defeated and may be hungry for the plums.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This can easily be overcome by a member or senator resigning his seat on the understanding that next day he may walk over to the unemployment insurance commission. It is just a farce.

Section agreed to.

Sections 84 to 87 agreed to.

On section 88—Organization and maintenance of employment service.

Mr. MacNICOL: This and the next three sections deal with the same matter. I assume the government proposes to take over all labour and employment offices operated by the various provinces. Will this government have to compensate the provincial governments for the buildings or equipment taken over? Will they take over the staffs now employed in the offices operated by the various provinces?

Mr. McLARTY: I do not think an answer of "yes" would be adequate for the questions asked by the hon. member for Davenport. As he knows, we now make a grant of \$150,000 to the provinces for the maintenance of employment offices. To say that we shall take them all over would be misleading; this will