

Unemployment Insurance Act

who sat on that industrial relations committee. It is quite possible that the people who were members of that committee could have found loopholes or modifications in the proposed recommendations contained in Bill No. C-43 which should have been considered.

If we do not agree that some good could result or some further information could be obtained from the investigation by this committee, then it seems to me it is a waste of the time of parliament to establish such a committee. I think we have been wasting our time. If this is an indication of the attitude of officials of departments toward the decisions of these committees, and it is reflected in every committee on which we sit, then I think some consideration must be given to it. I feel that the officials of this department must be asked how they were in a position to write this directive; to tell people what the stamps were going to cost; when it was going into effect; where it was going into effect, and all the other matters that were in bulletin 20.

It is a surprising thing, but we endeavoured to obtain copies of bulletin 20 and we were told it was unavailable. We have applied for a copy of the table of amounts, U.I.C. 465-4-59, and we have been told this also is unavailable at the distribution office. It seems to me odd that members of parliament cannot obtain a copy of this particular directive that has been floating around the country and which has been sent to nearly all the employers in certain districts. These are matters to which consideration will have to be given before we give our agreement to this bill. Some explanation must be given as to why the unemployment insurance commission has acted in the manner it has.

Then, too, consideration must be given to why the workers of Canada should be asked to pay, directly or indirectly, nearly \$100 million when they will only receive benefits estimated by the unemployment insurance commission at between \$20 million and \$25 million. It seems extremely odd that the workers are being asked to spend a dollar and only get 25 cents in return. I do not believe this is a good investment. I do not see how many of the members opposite are going to be able to vote for a measure of this nature. I do not think it is going to be a satisfactory answer to tell them that the 75 cents is for administration costs. Unless some further consideration can be given to this and some further explanation, I do not believe the workers of Canada are going to welcome the measure. They are not going to be awaiting it with open arms, nor are they going to want it when they get it.

Mr. Pickersgill: I just want to speak for one minute to support very warmly what has
[Mr. Peters.]

been said by the hon. member for Timiskaming. This is not by any means the first example we have seen of this government considering parliament as a rubber stamp. After the Easter recess there was a point raised by the Leader of the Opposition that the government, in the budget papers—I merely offer this by way of analogy—referred to a statute which had never been introduced, much less passed by this house, and gave a name to a statute that did not exist at all. In addition, they represented that payments had been made that had never been made, voted or even asked for by the government.

Now we have this action taken by the government, action taken under a measure that is controversial and that has not yet been passed by this parliament, just as though what parliament did mattered not at all. It seems to me, sir, this is an extraordinary reflection upon parliament. I can imagine that there would not have been just one minute or two minutes taken up when we were on the other side if this sort of thing had happened, but this sort of thing did not happen when Mr. St. Laurent was prime minister. It happens now because there is an extraordinary carelessness at the top in this government, in watching the proprieties, in considering parliament and the way parliament ought to be treated. This government simply takes it for granted that what happens here does not matter at all.

I think the hon. gentleman has made that very clear indeed. Every conceivable device short of closure itself is used by members of the treasury bench on every occasion on which a controversial measure comes before this house. This is another evidence of that steamroller mentality that we have had exhibited on so many occasions.

I should like also to join with the hon. member for Timiskaming in what he says about this special tax on two special classes of people. It is not insurance for their benefit at all; this is for the replenishment of this aspect of the fund which, as we have maintained from the outset of this debate, should be a charge upon the treasury and not upon two particular groups of citizens.

(Translation):

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming) has managed, through his customary tactfulness, to extend the debate considerably. Now that he has left the house, perhaps the discussion will proceed a little more apace.

Mr. Chairman, some rather direct charges were levelled against us. In fact, the hon. members for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot and Brome-Missisquoi (Messrs. Ricard and Graff-