

goes. He said he would have a chat with them. That is the way this government handles opposition; it has a chat.

Something that irks me about Bill C-14 is not so much what is in the bill but the way in which the government has handled it. Have you ever seen this government bring in legislation with regard to the corporations in this country? I was on the finance committee when Bill C-16, the Borrowers and Depositors Protection Act, was brought before it. I have seen amendments and changes to the Bank Act. This government would not bring in any changes which affect the way corporations do business in this country without first consulting them for their opinions and ideas.

When Bill C-14 was before the committee, there were witnesses who had some knowledge of unemployment insurance. In fact, they deal with the Unemployment Insurance Act almost every day of their lives. When asked, they told us that they had not been consulted about these changes.

The CLC was never consulted and neither was the CSN of Quebec. The National Union of Students and its counterpart in Quebec were not consulted on the contents of this bill. The government's own Advisory Council on the Status of Women was not consulted. The government should have advised that group what they were contemplating and asked for their opinion. However, they were not consulted at all.

The height of pomposity was the minister saying it was not up to them to consult but that the government should be consulted. It is not up to these organizations to consult the government. The government would never act in that way with regard to the corporate sector of this country.

We asked whether the government had consulted with the trade union movement because the bill specifically affected the subplans and the wage loss plans the unions had negotiated with employers. The deputy minister said they did not consult them. When we asked if the government was going to consult them, he said they would if they were asked. I have never seen such autocracy. I have never seen such—what is the word I am looking for?

An hon. Member: Liberals.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is right. They have acted like Liberals with regard to this bill. They do not consult with anybody; the people must consult with them. Not even the dictators of Latin America act that way. I know the minister will get up and plead innocent to a lot of what I have said.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand we are dealing with motion No. 1 which reads:

That Bill C-14, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended by deleting clause 1.

The hon. member's diatribe, most of it not based on fact, may be appropriate for second reading or third reading. However, when dealing with a specific motion that the clause be deleted, the hon. member's comments do not have any relevance.

Unemployment Insurance Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The hon. minister's point of order is well taken. I ask the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) to stick to the motion under consideration.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was speaking to the bill. Clause 1 of the bill reads:

(1) Paragraph 2(1)(r) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(r) "Minister" means the Minister of Employment and Immigration except in parts IV and VIII;"

As this is the minister of employment, I am right on the clause I am talking about. We have looked at this bill. It is important to get the thrust of what the government is trying to do on clause 1. We want to have it deleted. If it is deleted, the rest of the bill will become meaningless.

As I was saying, there was no consultation on clause 1 or any other clause. The minister cannot get up in this House later and say there was consultation because he admitted in committee there was none. There was no consultation with the provinces. In fact, the provinces have worked out what their costs will be under their welfare programs if Bill C-14 is carried.

A great debate began between the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen) and the provincial welfare ministers with regard to whose figures were right. What they did was typical. They set up a federal-provincial committee to study whose figures were right. Emanating from the provincial welfare ministers, and touted by the Tories, the lackeys in the House of Commons, was a two-tier system.

There was no consultation with the provincial ministers and no consultation with the trade union movement on clause 1 or any other clause. In fact, the Steelworkers of America pointed out they had several hundred contracts which were tied to the maximum unemployment insurance benefit. Lo and behold, in one fell swoop this minister says that collective agreements do not count. The government can cut right through to the heart of it, cutting right through collective agreements.

We found out that could mean up to \$17 a week in 1979-1980 under a collective agreement agreed to by workers and their employers. When they have a strike, the government will turn around and say that is what happens when you take off wage controls. The government is inciting workers into a situation where they will be developing bad relations between the employers and employees. What did the minister and deputy minister say in committee about that issue? They said that when the contract comes up for renegotiation, they can renegotiate a new figure.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest the hon. member get back to the terms of the debate and speak to motion No. 1.

Mr. Rodriguez: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was no consultation whatsoever on clause 1. Having given the background to the bill and what transpired in committee, I would like to make clear the lines that have been drawn in this debate. It is the government and the official opposition that are pushing