

Mr. Nystrom: I always respect the Chair, Mr. Speaker. The problem is the Conservatives are asking questions from behind the curtain. They are not even coming into the Chamber.

Mr. Symes: I rise on a point of order. It was the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen) who was heckling from behind the curtain.

Mr. Nystrom: I was talking about archaeological studies in Sudbury. My understanding is that under the second part of the motion with regard to creative use of unemployment insurance benefits, unemployed people can participate in creative things such as an archaeological study in a place like Sudbury, and still draw unemployment insurance benefits. In principle that may sound very well, but I suggest there will be problems with that type of program.

If an archaeological dig is worth-while, why is it not supported by government funds with people hired on a full-time basis for a full time job and with some kind of future? Programs of that sort, whereby people drawing unemployment insurance benefits can work a bit on the side, will probably create a backlash in the community and some resentment. Some people will become known as the type who are on unemployment insurance benefits a lot, like to work a little bit in programs of this sort, and go back on UIC benefits. That will create a backlash for the unemployment insurance program. It should be an unemployment insurance program and not a program to subsidize people who work part-time on certain programs.

The third point about the motion before us is the training program. Training programs are fine and well, providing there are jobs to go to once the person is trained. That is one of the problems we have in Canada. We have a very high rate of unemployment. To train someone for a non-existent job is demoralizing.

I can speak from personal experiences in my area. A number of native, Indian and Metis people and lower income white people in my constituency have been trained for a specific job or a specific skill. When they got out of the training program they found there were no jobs for them to go to and, understandably, they were frustrated. The psychological effect is bad. The government has done a good thing by training them in a new skill, but when they cannot find employment to exercise it, the effect is negative and they have to fall back again on assistance from the state.

● (2110)

I could give other examples of make-work programs in my riding where people have been left without resources once the projects run out. Along with these programs it is imperative that the government create more jobs. There should be tax cuts introduced in favour of lower and middle income people—they would use the extra money to buy clothing, shoes and so on, goods which are labour-intensive and whose manufacture provides employment. There should be an extension of the housing program as one way of putting people to work, not only directly but indirectly, besides accomplishing a useful

Employment and Immigration

social purpose. If the government were to do these things, the training program itself would be more effective.

I know that members in our party have had considerable influence with the minister in terms of amendments to this bill. One of the reasons we are participating in this debate so forcefully is to ensure that the unemployed are treated more fairly and that they have jobs to go to. Canada is a country of great resources and technical ability. All we need is a government plan to put people to work through the creation of wider employment opportunities.

I hope the minister will reconsider his opinion, and I hope the official opposition, led by the amiable and affable member for Hamilton West—even though he is a big rascal sometimes—will oppose the motion as I do, in which case perhaps we shall see a constructive change in these proposals. I trust the official opposition will bear in mind the interests of the little man, the working man the Conservative party always talks about. I see the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) is rising, no doubt to make a speech, so I will end my remarks at this point.

Mr. Cullen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, motion No. 5 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is consequential to motion No. 16. If motion No. 16 is negated there would be no vote on No. 5. Similarly, motion No. 6 in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) is consequential to motion No. 17, so it seems to me it would be appropriate to place them in the group upon which we are voting now.

Mr. Alexander: There can be no doubt about what the minister has just said. We have been dealing with job training, job creation, and work sharing. If my memory serves correctly motion No. 5 is in my name and motion No. 6 is in the name of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—he is a great Canadian but he is still a little rascal. We have talked about job training and work creation, so we might as well lock those motions in when we are voting in due time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I should like to hear the views of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) on this question.

Mr. Rodriguez: We on this side have no objection to putting motion No. 6, which stands in my name, together with the other motions mentioned on this group. They are certainly related.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Of course, when we get to put the question we will proceed in that way, but the Chair suggested that the question be put on motion No. 17 before motion No. 16. An affirmative vote on motion No. 17, would also dispose of motion No. 16. It is only if motion No. 17 is negated we would have a vote on motion No. 16.

Mr. Alexander: Motion No. 17 does dispose of motion No. 6 and motion No. 16 disposes of motion No. 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That was in my mind to say, anyway.