

Supply

is between 15 per cent and 11.5 per cent and so you get that great variance.

What side of the line do you live on? That is the question that is going to be asked in the high unemployment areas in this country with the passage of this new legislation. That is why I say that the legislation is very, very seriously flawed.

The other problem, and I will conclude with this point, is that it amazes me, as it would anybody, to realize that the House of Commons, made up of supposedly educated people with good research staff, and the House of Commons with its Library and all of the public servants in Canada, has not one single MP in this Chamber who knows exactly how the new bill is going to affect his province. Not one single MP. Why, Madam Speaker? Because they do not have the figures done up yet. That is what they claim.

Mr. Simmons: Deliberately so.

Mr. Baker: They do not have the figures done up. They claim that they do not know, that they are just compiling the figures now. If you ask: "How is it going to affect St. John's?" They say: "We are not sure, because we do not have the exact figures done up. We have to adjust them and so on. We do not know". If you ask: "How is it going to affect Gander?" They reply: "Oh, we don't know that. That's in a different zone. We do not know that". If some member stands up in the House of Commons and says "I know how it is going to affect all areas of my province", then he knows more than the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

That is the other thing that is wrong with the legislation. If you were to say to an unemployed person: "Boy, we are going to change the rules on you in January, but we do not know how many weeks you are going to need to qualify for unemployment insurance". The fellow would say: "Why did you change the rules if you do not know what the new rules are"? You would change them if you did not understand what unemployment is all about. You would change them without knowing the results, if you believed that people were too lazy to work. You would change them if you really believed that people were living off the system on \$200 a week. And, of course, you would change them if you wanted to do away with the unemployment insurance scheme alto-

gether. You would change the law to something that you did not know you were changing it to.

As far as the motion itself is concerned, let me conclude by saying that no bill should have ever passed this Chamber without us knowing the effects of that legislation. No bill should have been passed in this Chamber.

Shame on the Government of Canada. Shame on it for changing the system and not being able to say what it has been changed to and how it affects that unemployed person, the poorest of the poor. Today in Newfoundland, 101,000 people are drawing unemployment insurance with the average cheque just below \$200 a week and, in Canada, more people are drawing unemployment insurance than the government claims are unemployed. That is how serious the problem is.

I would suggest to the government that it simply pass the normal bill, extend the variable entrance requirement and then interview the people affected by this new legislation and see what they think.

Mr. Reid: As my hon. friend has indicated, I will have the opportunity to comment a little later. I cannot, as I could not with our friend from South West Nova, let what my friend from Gander—Grand Falls has just said pass by. While it sounds marvellous and looks terrific, if you look at where we are today and where this new legislation takes us, all that has been said to us is total puffery.

Mr. Allmand: You know better than the people in Newfoundland?

An Hon. Member: You should have been at the hearings.

Mr. Reid: First of all, I was at the hearings. I want to quote from some of the hearings about the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, about the Fishermen's Union and about the Newfoundland Advisory Board on the Status of Women, which advised the committee to change the economic zones, to put metropolitan St. John's in its own economic zone. That is what we have done.

Who set up the variable entrance requirements? It was the crowd opposite. My friend opposite calls them unconstitutional because they are decided by where you