

Unemployment Insurance Act

these increased rates to build up a big fund for distribution, as a result of the ambiguities in this act, just before the next election.

Brief after brief from both labour and management suggested that the fund should cover only those with reasonably steady employment, those who did not face the same hazards as those in seasonal employment. Seasonal workers should be covered by a special category, a separate type of insurance. If they are covered by the Unemployment Insurance Act, then the government should make contributions from the consolidated revenue fund to cover the cost of their insurance.

By charging larger contributions to most workers, many times over the cost of supplying the actual benefits, the government is actually taxing them to take care of the deficit and to make up for the fiscal mistakes of the government. In so far as the fund itself is concerned, I maintain that the fund would be rapidly increasing now under the management of the former government. It should be rapidly increasing at this time, and I say that by reason of the fact that two or three days ago the Minister of Labour said that there were more people employed now than in any other May in history. He also gave an indication, although I do not believe he said so, that in June the number of unemployed would be definitely reduced. The Minister of Finance said that the gross national product would go up by 7 per cent and would exceed \$34.5 million. The other day he said there would be less necessity for him to borrow money. I feel this is another indication that employment should be up.

The Prime Minister has intimated this outside of the house on different occasions. I see it is reported in the paper in front of me that the Canadian economy is on an upsurge. Why, then, do we have increases in the contribution at a time when there is the highest employment in our history; at a time when our Prime Minister and our responsible ministers are going around this country just exuding confidence? I know that they have great confidence in the situation because the Minister of Finance—I cannot say this very often—does go out and pay high interest rates. Why, then, make the small people of our country pay taxes that should properly be paid by all Canadians? The government should not be so callous. I have been in medical practice amongst workingmen all my life, and I know they want to pay their share but they do not want to pay more than their share. That is what the government is asking them to do under clause 6 of this bill.

I am making one last appeal to the minister for the workingman, for the man who carries

[Mr. McMillan.]

the dinner pail. I honestly believe he should not be singled out to pay for the mistakes in fiscal policy this government has made. I do not believe that he alone should carry the load of seasonal unemployment. We should all give him a break and just give him his fair share to carry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with clause 6, I should like to move:

That clause 6 be amended by deleting all the words after "act" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the words "is maintained".

The Chairman: An amendment has been moved by the hon. member for Welland, and in that connection I must refer the committee to Beauchesne's fourth edition, page 169, citation 202, subitem 14, which reads:

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order.

It is the opinion of the Chair that the present amendment deletes the clause of the bill in question and is therefore negative in its form. The same result could be obtained by voting against the clause. It is therefore the opinion of the Chair—

Mr. Pickersgill: Before Your Honour makes a ruling would you be prepared to hear argument?

The Chairman: I will finish my remarks, if you do not mind. It is therefore the opinion of the Chair that having regard to article 202, subparagraph (13), this amendment is out of order.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, before you make a final and definite ruling, could I direct Your Honour's attention to paragraph 278 on page 227 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, the third subparagraph of which reads:

Reductions can be made in committee on the bill, but no grant can be increased except upon recommendation of the crown.

It seems to me that if this clause were defeated there would be a defect in the whole bill in that there would be no provision whatsoever and no schedule whatsoever. Therefore the only way in which we can, without destroying the whole purpose of the act, successfully accomplish what my hon. friend from Welland wants to accomplish is to amend the clause in such a fashion that the bill stands on its feet. It is true that perhaps in substance the same effect would be obtained if the clause were simply defeated, but there would be no clause 6 at all in the bill and there would be no schedule left in the bill. Therefore it seems to me that for that reason this was the only effective way by which the hon. member could get the sense of the committee.