

But as a Conservative member said this bill is in fact a blank check for this government and nothing else. Why should we lose our time? On the one hand the government tries to justify its attitude and on the other the official opposition obviously wants to replace this government, though it would probably act in the same way.

What course would the Progressive Conservative party have taken in similar circumstances? Exactly the same as this government, which in fact amounts to saving one's face or saving one's skin.

Saving their face is more important than solving problems. Why not once and for all stop pursuing an ostrich policy and introduce a bill serving the interests of the Canadian people instead of those of the political schemers.

The important point is to give justice to the people but, generally speaking, the Unemployment Insurance Act is nothing more than a palliative for the sores caused by backward administrations.

They still persist in playing at being inquisitors. Indeed, even unemployment insurance officials are fed up with that legislation and they are the first to say that the problems keep growing from day to day since this new act came into force.

Above all, let us not question the workers. I know some who have already proffered threats and who are ready to clean out the local offices. I am prepared to cool or restrain their temper a bit, but never, Mr. Speaker, shall I defend the present system of inquisition under which individual integrity is jeopardized. Why wouldn't the government introduce a bill on a guaranteed minimum salary for all people or on that national dividend advocated by the Social Credit party?

Mr. Speaker, such a formula would not cast doubts on a person's integrity but would ensure a living to the worker, despite disruption of his employment, and that at the very moment he has no work.

The unemployment man would not be forced as he is now to wait for ten, 12 or even 15 weeks to obtain what he is entitled to, what is his due, what today a silly legislation takes away from him or makes available to him only after delays accountable to lack of funds, as now is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I will go even further. The national dividend formula would not put the government in the situation where it is now because it would be possible to do the estimates, which would be better than using variables and imponderables as a basis. The junior experts of the government would evaluate real data such as population, production, and the consumers' purchasing power. On a quarterly basis, these data would indicate the amount available for each individual. Willingly or not, whether it found funny or not our requests for higher old age security pensions in 1962, 1963, 1965, 1968 and again today, the government will have to use this solution. I believe of course that it might prefer to be mentioned in history as an expert in concealment. But I think, for its information, that the time has come to find modern solutions to modern problems. Unlike some of my colleagues, I do not think that the government is responsible because I do not consider it intelligent enough to cause the problems. It is

Unemployment Insurance Act

satisfied with justifying its errors by introducing legislation such as Bill C-124.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate to say so, but have we ever seen anything more stupid than a man who refuses to understand? Let us look at the group of members to my left and we will understand. Take them individually, and speak to them. They are intelligent, they accept our points of view, they suggest theirs but when they get together, no dice. It is impossible to get the tiniest spark of intelligence out of them.

Frankly, it is frustrating to see the inability of the government to get off the beaten path. Perhaps we should tell them about Henry Ford's technique when he was confronted with a problem that appeared insoluble. For example, when he wanted to install a one piece windshield on automobiles, he consulted his engineers and his experts who mathematically proved the impossibility of realizing such a dream. Mr. Ford then went to students, non-experts, and he ordered them to solve the problem by organizing contests and he finally got the results we know of. Why such success? Merely because Henry Ford applied the first major principle in administration: when you are faced with a problem, don't limit yourselves to the particulars. Wider the scope. Get off the beaten track. Stop patching the inner tube and invent the tubeless tire. That is the solution.

The government should stop introducing bills to excuse itself and bring forth legislation that really meets the needs and the rights of the individuals: then and only then it will respect its mandate as the people's representative instead of the financiers' who prefer to take advantage of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to bring up the subject again and ask hon. members how much interest they pay when they take a \$1 bill from their right pocket and change it for four quarters which they put in their left pocket? I am sure that you would all answer: Are you crazy? Why should I charge myself interest? I therefore ask them to read carefully clause 2 of the bill and to transpose my question. Then they will understand the spirit of the bill and the Social Credit argument.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, since the funds provided under the warrants which the bill seeks to bury are already spent or will soon be, I think that it is advisable to let bygones be bygones and let it pass as an administrative experience, hoping that the government will learn one day to introduce realistic bills.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before I recognize the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), perhaps I could deal with the point of order which arose yesterday. The point of order arose concerning the amendment presented by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). In technical terms, this is a reasoned amendment and most reasoned amendments present extraordinary difficulties to the chair. This one fits that category of difficulty.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member reads as follows:

This House, while accepting the need to provide funds for payment of unemployment insurance benefits to those entitled, declines to approve a measure which, on the one hand removes all