

unemployment whereby there has been an excessive drain. That is the part of the social measure that the government could contribute to this fund, the same as in 1962. If this thing had been properly funded in 1962, that might not have happened. The government used a free flow of funds through the unemployment insurance account as one measure to revitalize an economy that was already sick late in 1956.

**Mr. Francis:** But—

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** The hon. member had his opportunity. I will ask him to please let me continue my case. The unemployment insurance fund, of course, had heavy calls on it, from late 1957, or principally from 1958 through to 1961, and the government used it as one means to stimulate the economy. Loans were made to the fund, not direct drafts, and I would think that an investment fund can have loans made to it. But I am making the case here for a proper funded account, an insurance account, and I want to know from the minister why the change to merely an account?

There are two other little matters I want to refer to, and then I shall sit down. First of all, I think the experience rating concept may have some difficulties in it. I think, essentially, this is right. In other words, where there has been a very high incidence of unemployment, then just like in insurance I think the people involved have to pay a higher premium. However I want to point up one item as a matter of caution, and this is a derogation from my real acceptance of experience rating. It is that in so many of the construction trades the hiring and the firing are not handled by the employer. There are many subtrades and the journeymen working for subcontractors are placed in, on, or off a job by the union hiring hall. If this turnover, which is artificial as far as the employer is concerned, is used as an experience rating in order to penalize the employer then I think that is wrong. I hope that the minister can tell us how he can go against that. If he can, then I say that by and large I am quite happy with the idea of experience rating.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The other thing is that all of us have received representations from teachers, nurses and other groups hitherto exempt and now to be included. I have always felt, personally, that the various exceptions which existed in the past and the confusion of seasonal workers with regular workers, created the greatest difficulties in the application of the Unemployment Insurance Act. I know that a lot of teachers are going to say this is merely a tax but many other people will have to pay, too. An argument I heard this afternoon was to the effect that they were going to be pretty well set. With security of tenure, it was hoped that no one would lose employment and therefore why should they pay? But in those provinces where we have to pay annual premiums for medicare, we hope we are not going to have to avail ourselves of the service. I pay premiums for medicare in the province of Alberta, but I certainly hope that I never have to use it.

#### *Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971*

I will admit that this is going to cause some real problems, and I am not too sure that there was adequate consultation in regard to this. We only know that the body economic and politic of this country is bearing an excessively high load for the cost of education. The minister knows that every penny that is paid either by the teacher or the employer is going to come from the taxpayer because in the next round of negotiations after this act comes into force the unemployment insurance contributions of the teachers will be part of the fringe benefits to be exacted from the employer. Therefore we, the ultimate taxpayers, the consumers of this country, will have to pay the shot. To that extent, we all share this additional burden. I hope the provincial civil servants will come in, as I would not want them to opt out of this scheme.

This afternoon I raised the question about the member of Parliament on salary. Does he qualify? He is not under a contract of employment, so I don't know. There is no formal contract, but I would like him to try to step out of it. He can resign, but until he does somebody is bound to pay him. It seems to me there are counter obligations and, in fact, a contract and therefore he should be entitled to contribute. If you lose an election, you could sit back and draw \$100 a week for the next 52 weeks. The only thing is you would be trying to obtain the same kind of employment. I suppose the same type of test will be applied as in the past—the minister shakes his head. There is going to be a change. Perhaps there is that silly limitation that used to apply that unless the job is exactly comparable the claimant could engage in some sort of flim-flam with the commission and would not have to work but could draw benefits.

I could add a lot more, Mr. Speaker, but I have heard that I have overstepped the time allotted to me. I hope to see amendments in the committee. I would like to see the bill go to committee, but I will make up my mind on the bill when it comes back.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I just finished a lengthy discussion with the chairman of the Agricultural Committee regarding that famous marketing bill, so I may apologize to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) if I throw a few cattle and hogs into the unemployment insurance bill. This afternoon we find ourselves debating this piece of legislation before it goes to committee. The legislation is the result of a white paper which had some exhaustive study in the labour committee of this House. This was the best they could devise.

I read the minister's speech when he introduced the bill and I note that he said it is for the general benefit of the workers—and I underline that word "workers"—in Canada today. The main purpose is to help people temporarily out of work. That is what he said. The government adopts the idea of universality but the bill does not include the self-employed. That is a queer definition. The principle of universality is accepted but the bill immediately excludes some of the people who are paying into the unemployment insurance plan, as the self-employed