

Adjournment Debate

In any event, we find in section 6(2) as proposed in this measure that those rights are restricted in the event that a provincial government imposes laws primarily on the basis of some internal requirement the province may have. That is a sham. It does not answer the question in respect of real rights of mobility in the country, and this government in introducing that as a panacea for the problem is defrauding the public. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Dennis Dawson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that, in spite of his reservations concerning the resolution presented to this House, I believe that the progress accomplished through this resolution compared with the situation he deplors concerning the resistance of Newfoundland in relation with the hiring of workers from outside the province and concerning the problem of Quebec, which set restrictions to job mobility in the employment sector—I believe that even though no resolution can be perfect, as we are all aware, instead of speaking this evening, he should rise tomorrow in the House and say that he supports entrenchment in the constitution of the right to job mobility, the right for people to move from one province to the other and the right to education in the language of their choice. This is more or less what he objects to in the case of Quebec. I believe that he should start by criticizing the province of Ontario, and refer especially to the right to development in the maritimes and the western provinces. But in any case—

[English]

This position notwithstanding, we favour the concept of a national labour market to respond to worker and employer needs across the country so that all Canadians may enjoy the benefits of economic expansion. It should be noted that the employment referral activities of the CEIC are governed by the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1971 and the national employment service regulations pertaining to the act. Nothing in the act or regulations gives a preference based on the residence of the worker seeking employment.

In practice, however, it is normally in the best interests of an employer to hire from the local labour force to the maximum extent possible. This is less costly and makes for a more stable and contented work force. In this regard it is the practice of the Canadian employment centres to exhaust the potential of the local labour force on behalf of an employer before extending the search to other regional and/or the national labour markets.

Reference to the federal powers to disallow certain kinds of provincial legislation is a matter with which the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) is not prepared to deal here. Such matters more properly fall within the purview of others.

I wish to reiterate, however, that except in those cases where affirmative action is judged to be in the best interest of certain disadvantaged groups our preference is for an open labour market which allows freedom of movement in pursuit of employment to all Canadians. That is why this government is moving toward the entrenchment of the liberty of movement in this country. It is on this concept that many of the commission's programs are developed. The Canada Manpower Mobility Program, which encourages the movement of Canadian workers from regions of high unemployment to low unemployment, either to seek jobs or to relocate once jobs have been found, is but one example.

● (2220)

This government has followed such a practice in the past, and if we compare its actions with those of the previous government during the period it was in office I am sure we would see that we are encouraging the mobility of employment and encouraging opportunity so that people will not be part of ten little provinces but part of one big country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.