

*The Address—Mr. Caccia*

In the meantime the government of Canada will need to come to grips with excess profits, difficult to define, I agree, and to tax windfall and excess profits in order to assure the Canadian public that there is justice in our tax system. In 1973 banks and a number of corporations piled up incredibly high profits. The Canadian public considers these profit levels simply intolerable. Something must be done about them.

While prices are increasing, the consumer, in a rather complex market, needs continuous advice and help, both in the form announced in the last session by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) and in the form of community level and neighbourhood help. This sort of help must be made available, particularly in the larger urban centres of Canada. The help centres ought to be staffed by persons who are deeply committed to the public and to the protection of the consumer.

If I may move to another subject, the vast majority of Canadians supported the measures which the government and this Parliament took in controlling foreign takeovers. The recent announcement by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) about the Canadian football league has strengthened that approach. With that in mind, it is disturbing to learn what has been happening, for instance, in connection with M.L.W. Worthington Company of Montreal. That company was stopped by the Worthington Company of New Jersey from exporting locomotives to Cuba. I am inclined to think that the majority of Canadians would like to urge the government to stop the dependence of foreign controlled companies located in Canada on the laws of the country of the foreign corporation. We seem to be making some progress on this question because of the position developed in Argentina by some of the companies that are of a multinational character and which are engaged in a trade negotiation in Cuba as well.

● (1520)

I do not think we should be pressing this measure just because it has been possible for another country to achieve it. We should be pressing it on its own merits, on the question that a multinational corporation operating in Canada operates under the laws of Canada and not under the laws of another country. In the same category of disturbing events which belongs to years past, I would put the special treatment of *Time* magazine and *Readers' Digest*, a treatment that is presently accorded under the Income Tax Act. I urge the government to remove this treatment at the time of our next budget.

In the Speech from the Throne, mention is made of the Unemployment Insurance Act and possible amendments. I would like to dwell on this subject for a few moments. The concept of unemployment insurance served a good purpose in its time. It is a concept that is borrowed from the private sector, namely of insuring income in time of need by means of contributions which working Canadians make in the form of premiums while they are employed. It seems, however, that in the seventies this concept is becoming rapidly outdated.

In the seventies we not only have automation of the so-called post-industrial society, but we have people with better education, something we have stressed as being

[Mr. Caccia.]

desirable. We have an increasing number of people who are seeking meaningful jobs in society. They simply reject the idea of working for a large corporation by doing something monotonous and of little significance to their own personality. A symptom of this is the high percentage of absenteeism found in the large automotive plants of this country. Despite the wages that are commanded, the rate of absenteeism is very high.

Other factors are changing in this decade. We have, as a result of experiments through LIP and OFY, discovered a large range of jobs that are non-profit in nature, beneficial to the community and considered to be desirable. For this reason, the time has come to turn the unemployment insurance concept into a positive institution, not one that picks up the fallout of the private sector when it cannot produce new jobs or maintain the existing level of jobs, but one that is of a job creating nature. I will try to outline this idea as quickly as I can.

Under a positive system of employment insurance, if I may call it that, the premiums paid by employed Canadians would go to the creation of jobs for those who are unemployed. We have a better educated labour force. There is an increasing need for services not provided by the private sector, services for senior citizens, retarded children, migrants and immigrants in the large cities as well as the performance of certain works in maritime Canada in the environment and in the forests, in the improvement or redressing of the environment damaged by man.

In the present unemployment insurance fund, there is sufficient wealth to ensure employment instead of simply insuring unemployment as we have been doing up until now. If we were to have an employment creating commission, a person who becomes unemployed would have a few options. As at present, he would be interviewed to see whether he qualifies for Manpower training. If so, he would take the Manpower training route. Another option would be leaving the labour force for a period of time and requesting a payment of benefits. If over the years a person had accumulated the necessary credits, that would be a prior condition, he could just leave the labour force for a certain period of time. The credits for the unemployed person would be in direct proportion to the number of years the person worked in the labour force. The longer one worked, the greater the credit, and that would govern the length of time the person could withdraw from the labour force and be paid by the fund. This could be in the form of a period of time during which a person could better his education, see the world, repair his house or engage in any other kind of activity he had in mind.

The third option open to a person who becomes unemployed, cannot find a job in the private sector, does not qualify for Manpower training and does not have sufficient credits to leave the Labour force for a period of time, would be an offer by the employment commission of a job in the public sector which would be subsidized as the result of the creation of this fund. The fund, by the way, now exists, only for a different purpose. Canadians who are employed would pay premiums to provide jobs for those who are unemployed, do not qualify for Manpower training or do not have the necessary credits to leave the labour force. The jobs created in this way would not be