

access to the expertise developed in committee which helped arrive at the decision.

I still believe that clause 28 could work to the advantage of claimants who have a long-term attachment to the labour market and were laid off without hope of recall by a company for which they had worked for a long time. They should have the opportunity of using UIC money for several weeks while they seek employment. I believe most of the people I come in contact with would use the money to advantage.

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) finds fault with the committee. He should have shown an interest when the committee was sitting. I am not finding fault with him in this regard because I know he is very busy and cannot be everywhere at once. We in this party reject the hon. member's motion most strongly. We have called for a public inquiry to determine what the disincentives in this act are and how they can be removed. It was pointed out to members of the committee that the three-week advance payment in clause 28 is a disincentive to work. The minister puts a figure of something like \$5 million on it, but I am not interested in figures as much as I am in the fact that the government is creating disincentives in the act. The experiment was well intentioned, but I would respectfully suggest that it went sour. This three-week advance payment was meant to assist people in finding work, but that is not what happened. They took the money and left. In my estimation, after deliberation, these provisions played a significant role in destroying the work ethic.

**Some hon. Members:** Huh!

**Mr. Alexander:** My friends say "Huh". I say it is a disincentive, it was being abused and it should go. We in this party will not vote for the hon. member's motion. Let me bring the hon. member up to date on what happened in committee. The committee was provided with a document prepared by the minister's officials which gave a history of problems and suggested solutions for all particular amendments that came in. It is unfortunate that the hon. member was busy and that members of his party have not shown the document to him.

**Mr. Paproski:** He always "peters" out.

**Mr. Alexander:** He means well, but at times we have to straighten him out.

**Mr. Peters:** Would the hon. member mind tabling a copy?

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by reading into the record a portion of the Unemployment Insurance Commission information paper on Bill C-69. On page 2 under the heading, "Subject: Advance Payment—Present Legislation", it reads:

The present legislation provides for a three-week advance payment of benefits to major attachment claimants after the two-week waiting period. This payment is made to claimants who have been laid off from their employment and who are not expected to be recalled by their previous employer within five weeks of the interruption of earnings. The payment is also provided irrespective of earnings and the active job

### *Unemployment Insurance Act*

search and availability obligations during that period.

When this provision was introduced, it was thought that it normally took five or six weeks for people to find new jobs. The purpose of the advance payment was, therefore, to provide a strong incentive for claimants to find work quickly in the early weeks of their claims and draw no subsequent benefits.

**Problem:**

It was found in 1974, however, that 85 per cent of the recipients of the advance payment were still on claim in the sixth week, whereas only 66 per cent of the non-recipients remained on claim at that point. This led to the conclusion that the original purpose of the advance payment was not being achieved.

**Proposed Amendment:**

In order to encourage recipients of advance payment to find work more quickly, it is proposed that the provision be removed from the legislation.

I questioned the minister, my good friend, about the meaning. I will not misquote him or take him out of context. I said, "Mr. Minister, are you stating that in fact"—mind you, the word "disincentive" is not within the confines of the document that I just read—"or are you suggesting that you found, as a result of your studies, that this particular clause is a disincentive to work?" The minister said, "Yes." Be that as it may, and keeping in mind on this side of the House we want an act that is cognizant of the disincentives that have been destroying the work ethic and that we should have them removed, I repeat that we accept the government's statement in this regard and reject the hon. member's motion.

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, I was not going to say anything on this—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** "But".

**Mr. Rodriguez:** —but I have been convinced, after listening to the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) that I ought to say a few words because this question is important. All I heard from the hon. member for Hamilton West in committee was "incentives" and "disincentives," and the minister talked about "the work ethic" and "disincentives." Why is it that members of parliament, who enjoy probably one of the highest incomes in this country—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** —feel that having subsidized meals in the House of Commons restaurant is not a disincentive?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I recognize the sensitivity of hon. members—

**An hon. Member:** Give your increase to charity.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Why is the increase to parliamentarians and senators not called a disincentive to work? Why is it that we call moneys handed to multinational corporations incentives—

**An hon. Member:** Does he come from northern Ontario?