

● (2130)

Politically, however, there is a legitimate demand in the country for the creation of jobs. Governments rarely have the privilege or the funds to do both. I do not know which way the Government will proceed. I know that it is a political decision that is not easy to make. That is why the *Wall Street Journal*, when talking about the deficit and the need to finance it, asked what lessons we have learned from the recession. I think that it is a little too early for Canadians to begin determining what lessons should be learned since we are at least six months behind the United States, but I remember the lessons which we learned from the last Depression. I was young in those days but old enough to remember. In my home I had a particular job which I recall doing. It was to run down to the bank at noon on every Friday to change \$5 into nickels and dimes. My mother would hand that out with a sandwich, apple or orange to some unfortunate person who would knock on the door and say "charité". I remember that expression from some cold nights when we would invite these people in to dine.

I am not proud of the fact that we would sometimes ride our bicycles to Val Cartier camp to see for ourselves the thousands, or five or ten thousand people living in tents because they were destitute and without any income. Their families were back home, split up and living with other relatives. If you think that I am exaggerating, read "The Ten Lost Years" or, better still, as I recall, the book review by the late Hugh Garner in *Saturday Night* when that magnificent book came out.

We learned lessons in that Depression and certain basic programs evolved from those lessons. Those people who read anything about Mackenzie King would see that the over-riding philosophy behind family allowance, as seen by Mackenzie King, was that it was a legitimate way of stimulating the economy. He realized the impact of a recession or a depression. Unemployment insurance, a concept that we stole from another Party, was brought under federal jurisdiction in 1943 or 1944. Old age pensions came in in the 1940s. Canadians learned the lesson that they did not want to have to go to war the next time in order to bring an end to a depression or a recession.

That is why I was somewhat upset last week when Members actually stood in the House of Commons and questioned the tremendous increase in unemployment insurance premiums. Thank God if you are one of the lucky ones that has a job and you are called upon to pay the maximum of \$2 a week, which is what it is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: It is \$2 a week. If you still resent your \$2 a week, take some consolation from the fact that it is tax deductible and will probably cost you about \$1.50 a week. That \$1.50 a week means that the Government can continue to respect the integrity of unemployment insurance.

An Hon. Member: You put a ceiling on it.

Supplementary Borrowing Authority

Mr. Mackasey: I would like to get into specifics, if I may. There is a ceiling, but the hon. gentleman was wrong in his figures. If you are over that figure, you still pay at the \$29,000 or \$30,000 rate. If you are so unlucky to be out of work, you draw accordingly, as if your income was \$30,000. Therefore, you pay over that ceiling in any event. Ninety seven point eight per cent of Canadians, including teachers, clergymen, the army and the Public Service, are covered by unemployment insurance—all new categories prior to 1972. No one gets a free ride.

The Hon. Member for Saskatoon East reminded us that it is important, when exercising our vocation as politicians, that we somehow do not harm those innocent people who are not here to defend themselves. I find it mind-boggling when I read newspaper reports about views expressed in the House reflecting the opinion of one business organization that 60,000 jobs in this country would somehow disappear because the work force was asked to donate \$1.50 a week after taxes.

One question the research of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) when he stands up in the House to suggest that unemployment insurance contributions, which are increased by a maximum \$2 a week, will somehow put 60,000 Canadians out of work. The bulk of that money is coming from employees and their employers. It was self-appointed spokesmen for small business who are saying that it will bankrupt us. I can remember in 1972 when those same people complained to me as Minister of Manpower or Minister of Labour, when times were fairly buoyant, about how to keep their trained employees. They asked, "How do I keep my pressman whom I have trained for 13 years when he can go down the street and work for the same pay but with maternity or sickness benefits included, because I as a small businessman cannot afford to pay the cost of a private maternity plan or sickness and accident plan?" Private enterprise was not particularly anxious at that time to provide that type of coverage, and we therefore included it in unemployment insurance. We made the big industry divide that obligation as well as everyone else.

When we talk about unemployment insurance, we are talking about Canadians who are out of work through no fault of their own. They are out of work because our economic system and free enterprise system is not perfect and cannot always provide the number of jobs that are needed. That does not absolve those of us who believe in free enterprise or private enterprise of our moral obligation to the less fortunate. As someone said to me on the phone today, one of the reasons that we are not in a depression, but rather in a recession, is that, through the \$8 billion we have redistributed to the economy through unemployment insurance, we have made it possible for many communities to remain prosperous, solvent and at least viable. One thing we have accomplished is to eliminate the violence that we might see in the streets of Canada if one million people were totally divorced or cut off from benefits were we to stand up in the House to say that we cannot afford \$2 a week more for unemployment insurance benefits.