

ment levels of the province and particularly of the city. The British Columbia Federation of Labour submitted a brief which contained many proposals, to some of which I will refer. It noted particularly the large gap between job forecasting at the federal level and the meeting of those forecasts through the manpower retraining programs. The federation told us of men and women who had been trained for jobs for which there was no demand and which were often non-existent. Interestingly enough, they also told us that some skills were needed but there was no manpower retraining program for meeting those needs. The department did not provide the requisite courses. What the federation told us in British Columbia was exactly similar to what we had been told in St. John's, Newfoundland, two months ago. We were told that manpower retraining centres in St. John's were turning out hundreds of hairdressers. They turned out more hairdressers in St. John's than there were women in Newfoundland to use their services. That was a perfectly absurd situation.

The B.C. federation said that manpower retraining programs should bear some relationship to demand for workers in the market place. No reasonable person can question that suggestion. The federation appropriately stressed the cruelty of changing at this time the eligibility criteria for unemployment insurance—that is, upping the ante, so to speak—from 8 weeks to 12 weeks before people could be eligible to collect unemployment insurance. Surely that is a profoundly cruel action when more than one million Canadians are unemployed. It simply adds insult to injury.

Another question of concern raised in the brief was that many now being employed on LIP projects are simply doing work which would have been done in other ways by skilled workers. The federation told us of community projects on which, normally, plumbers or carpenters would be employed. Since the work was done under a LIP grant, either volunteer workers or workers who worked for substantially lower wage rates were hired to do the job. That ought to concern all of us. We support the LIP program. I do not want that misunderstood. But it is important not to be deceived about some of the consequences of these projects. We are simply giving one group of people jobs which otherwise would be performed by men and women earning a much higher salary. We ought to be concerned, since we are merely shifting the locus of unemployment.

Another submission I found moving was that of the representative of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. This was a very moving documentation and a generalization that at a time of high unemployment, women are the last to be hired and the first to be fired. The case that was generally made was at this time with this level of unemployment, women in Canada suffer disproportionately more than men. Again they provided the data to document the case. It was a sad one.

● (1640)

It should concern us that the female sex in Canada, which has historically been unfairly treated, and those of us in the

Economic Policy

opposite sex in the past few years are gradually becoming conscious of that fact—

Miss Campbell: It is long overdue.

Mr. Broadbent: I agree with the hon. member that it is long overdue. I will add that it is long overdue on my part. All I say is that we should be increasingly aware of this inequality. We should be aware of the discrimination that exists toward the female sex which is particularly felt at times of unemployment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. Nevertheless he may continue if there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. A further brief was submitted by the minister of the First United Church in Vancouver. It might interest hon. members to know that that church is located in the east end of Vancouver, not one of the more posh parts of town where doctors, lawyers and well paid university professors reside. It is a poorer part of Vancouver with a disproportionate number of drifters, unemployed, and those who are down and out.

I was told by people on the scene that the minister worked very hard preparing the brief. I commend him for bringing this to our attention. It indicates that the controls in operation, allegedly from province to province, controlling rents have no effect at all for most of the people for whom he was speaking.

The people for whom this minister was concerned in his brief live in small hotels. There is no control on the rates for the rooms in small hotels. In many cases the people pay a weekly or daily rate for a room. They do not rent an apartment nor do they own a condominium. They simply have a small and in many cases barren and cold room. He found that the rent went up, not by 10 or 15 per cent, but in some cases by 80 per cent for those rooms in the east end of Vancouver.

I do not know whether this survey was conducted in his parish. It was certainly an area of Vancouver that he knows well. He found that these people spent between 75 and 80 per cent of their income on rent. On the average, they had \$1 a day to spend on food, clothing and anything else they may need.

Amongst these people, and I suspect the majority of them, were the unemployed. Are they the people who the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) refers to when he says we are living beyond our means? I have my doubts. If we are concerned about rent control and applying it effectively, surely that is an area that we should move into quickly to ensure that the small hotels do not exploit in a very unfair and cruel way the poor people who live in that part of Vancouver.

Another brief I was given had been prepared by the Vancouver and District Labour Council. They stressed the important issue of hidden unemployment. They were concerned that the unemployment figures in Canada were really much higher than official statistics suggest. In particular, they stressed that