when unemployment was even higher. The Leader of the Opposition knows the terrible rate of unemployment, the degradation and the loss of dignity of the people of Nova Scotia when he was premier of that province. It should be plainly on the record that the Leader of the Opposition did not get up to repudiate that statement. You cannot have it both ways; that is a lesson everybody in this House should understand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis).

Some hon. Members: Shame.

• (2140)

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, all those Quebec members seem to know so much about Nova Scotia. Would the minister take the time, now that he has brought Nova Scotia into the picture, to tell us why and how he, as a former minister, could make the judgment that 10 per cent of UIC benefits belong to the people and not to the company? In other words, we will give the UIC 10 per cent and the government 9 per cent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member should not take advantage of a point of order to ask a question. If he wants to ask a question he should seek permission from the hon. member who has the floor. Also, the question cannot be asked in the manner in which it was asked by the hon. member because it is an argument.

**Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which arises from your decision. I did not rise on a point of order; I asked the former minister for permission to put a question.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): You did not hear me. Wait until Hansard comes out tomorrow. You will then see, also, that one of your ministers got caught because he was not listening.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I wish to remind the hon. member that the Chair did not find the question to be proper as to form.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, if I were a bitter man, which I am not, maybe I would have risen on a point of order to point out that the hon. member called me a minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mackasey:** May I say this in conclusion: the \$800 million is nothing more than a sum of money upon which the Unemployment Insurance commission can borrow from time to time for the daily operations which are necessary under the act and are accountable to government and to the people through the annual statement. Whatever they borrow is repayable to the government. The government in turn will pay its debt to the Unemployment Insurance Commission when it has tallied up some time in April or May, and that of course is the debt that

## Unemployment Insurance Act

results from the fact that unemployment at the present moment is over 4 per cent. I might must say that when the rate of unemployment gets down below 4 per cent—

## Some hon. Members: When?

Mr. Mackasey: —and it will, the maximum benefit period will be 25 weeks instead of 52 weeks. The people on minor attachment will be limited to 18 weeks. which should please the opposition. In other words, we would be saving money, which is our concern, and the people will be back to work, about which everybody will be happy. But we cannot have it both ways, and I say this very sincerely. The act is costing more than anticipated for logical reasons which the minister mentioned.

In Canada there are 8,500,000 or more who are working and who are earning more money than ever before. This country is affluent and can well afford to pay the 90 cents or \$1 a week to those who are less fortunate. If we cannot that is unfortunate, or if we do not want to that is even more unfortunate. But if we are going to reduce unemployment, and we will—and I say "we" collectively in this House because I do not think anybody particularly appreciates it—then in the interval we cannot do as the opposition has tried to do, ridicule the unemployment insurance plan; but it did not quite succeed because people came to their senses in time.

If they want to further emasculate the plan, they are not helpless. If they want to put a stigma on it, they are going about it the right way. But sooner or later sanity will prevail in the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mackasey:** People will then understand the Liberal party in the last election. Those who seek to exploit the poor will find out that the poor do not forget that easily.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales) seeks the floor for the purpose of asking a question.

**Mr. Hales:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question. He referred to the accounts receivable situation. Is it not a fact that the employers' and the employees' contributions are paid in by the fifteenth of the following month, throughout the year? Why is it, then, that the Department of National Revenue does not have a running record of the payments month by month, so we do not have to wait until the T4 forms are in?

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is, as usual, fairly accurate. There is a statute that says that the Department of National Revenue must accumulate these contributions monthly, and eventually they do get the unemployment insurance. But in the meantime we borrow from the \$800 million. I do not want to suggest that this is just to finance the employer-employee side; it is also to obtain sums of money which the government owes. But we must not forget that unemployment insurance is taxable and substantial sums of money will be coming in as