

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

worker is paying a lot more than he is going to receive. I suggest that is not fair or honest, and I am not in favour of that type of policy. Several organizations have also suggested that we should bring the civil service within the scope of the legislation, because there are 140,000 civil servants. I do not think it is very fair to bring in these 140,000 lost souls, because they have no chance of getting anything out of the plan. They are guaranteed their jobs as long as they continue to do the work for which they are hired. They are fairly well protected. If they were called upon to contribute to the plan they would just be another milk cow, because they would not get anything from the plan. I do not think that is fair or just, and we should not adopt that suggestion in order to increase the amount of money in the fund.

Let us say that contributions to the fund are increased by \$100 million this year. If unemployment continues to be as bad as it has been for the last two years I suggest that the fund will be broke before another two years have passed. We have not got enough money and cannot pay enough money into the fund on this basis to carry the scheme. We cannot carry the unemployment we have had in the last two years no matter what we do about the premiums paid by the people covered by unemployment insurance.

If unemployment continues, and I certainly hope it does not, we are going to have to come back to parliament again in a short time and ask for supplementary grants to the fund from the treasury of Canada so these payments can be continued. When that happens I think everybody will agree that is the way it should be done. In the meantime I do not think there is any point in asking Canadian workers or Canadian employers, if you want to include them, to increase their contributions by 30 per cent to raise a certain sum of money when the workers have no chance of getting a fair percentage of it back from the fund.

For that reason I do not believe the government are being very fair to the workers when they ask them to make contributions beyond the amount they can get back from the fund. It is a little bit like going to a horse race, shall I say. Quite often you bet \$2 and you lose your shirt, but at least you have a chance to get back that amount or more. You are not paying \$2 for something that will only return you 60 cents or 70 cents.

There is another question that has not been answered, and it has to do with the action of the unemployment insurance commission

itself. According to a letter that the hon. member for Timmins read into the record yesterday the commission issued a directive to a number of employers in Canada, and the directive must have gone out very early in the month of June.

I should like to ask the minister this question. When did the unemployment insurance commission decide it was inevitable that Bill C-43 would pass through the industrial relations committee and the House of Commons without any major change, and that it should go into effect on June 28? I do not think the officials of the unemployment insurance commission have the right to say that parliament cannot make any change in the legislation. I do not think they have the right to draw up these directives without first having seen what parliament is going to do with the bill now before us. What authority have they received, and from what source, to order the amendments into effect? This is what has happened in the directive, bulletin No. 20, which they sent out to employers.

Have the officials of the unemployment insurance commission already ordered the new issues of stamps with the amounts shown on them? If they have, how could they tell what was going to happen in parliament. Does this mean that the officials of some government departments look at the huge Conservative majority and say to themselves that the Conservative majority can steamroller through anything they want; that this is what we recommended to the minister, and we are sure that the minister will produce it?

If this is true, Mr. Chairman, I think it is probably as flagrant a disregard of parliament as we have seen. I believe these allegations should be answered and we should know these particular things. The fact that these bulletins went out is only an indication that they were already published. I am not so much concerned about whether or not they went out, but I am concerned with the attitude and mentality of officials who have been able to decide for themselves, in a dictatorial way, that this is what the act is going to say; this is what the interpretation is going to be; this is the way we are going to implement it. I do not believe that shows much regard for parliament. It makes a hollow mockery of the establishment of a committee and having these people come before it, especially if there is no intention whatever of allowing amendments.

Although the opposition is very small in numbers, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it can be assumed that there is no intelligence in that opposition. This is true not only of the opposition, but I think there was a considerable amount of intelligence amongst the representatives from both sides of the fence