

Unemployment Insurance Act

Axworthy), to bring in band-aid measures to help overcome some of the small problems, such as the four programs which he recently announced.

In the throne speech we were told that two main principles would guide us into the 1980s. One of them would be that Canadians would have to live within their means. I submit to you that we can accept that principle if Canadians have the means within which to live. If you look at people in Oshawa and Windsor, however, you find that they no longer have those means. They typify people in many other areas in Canada employed in other than the auto industry. I think that as Canadians we should try to live within our means, but only if we have those means. We do not need band-aid measures such as those brought in by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who is incapable of bringing in effective programs to help keep Canadians working so that rates of unemployment can be kept below 4 per cent. In areas of the country where unemployment is below 4 per cent, both workers and employers should be responsible for keeping that figure low, but in areas where unemployment reaches up to 30 per cent, there are other ways to provide employment.

What we were also told in the throne speech as being the main core of the Liberal government's program was that Canadians would have to accept the sacrifice of meeting the challenges of the 1980s. I think it is terrible that we in a country such as Canada have to make sacrifices. We have very much in terms of intelligent people who have a high degree of education. Also we can produce the necessary technology in order to have secondary industries owned by Canadians, and to process our resources. We are rich in resources as well. For those reasons, why should Canadians have to accept sacrifices? There is the sacrifice in terms of this bill which relates to high unemployment in Canada. High unemployment causes a lot of stress among families and the single unemployed person. The lack of income generated affects people with fixed incomes such as those on unemployment insurance and pensions. We should not have to accept sacrifices during the 1980s. We should have a high standard of living second to none anywhere in the world.

● (1540)

I think we will have to accept sacrifices because of people like the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who is totally ineffective in answering questions sincerely directed to him in the House. Perhaps this forces the Liberal cabinet member from the west to cover the tracks of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce by bringing in temporary, short-term measures to give Canadians some sort of means within which to live.

We will have to make sacrifices because of foreign ownership in the country which takes away from Canadians, which has been condoned by Liberals and Conservatives in the House for many, many years.

Mr. Young: And the huge deficit.

Mr. Anguish: Foreign ownership amounts to over \$75 billion. There is the huge deficit to which the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Young) referred. Last year there was a spending deficit of \$16,185 million. Going back to foreign ownership, it results in profits of over \$4 billion leaving this country every year. If that \$4 billion was kept in Canada by Canadian ownership, it could produce a lot of jobs so that maybe our unemployment rate would be held to 4 per cent or less, and then likely the employees and employers would be happy to contribute that amount in UIC premiums. I do not think the working public should have to contribute enough to make up for the incompetence of this government and its inability to meet the needs of Canadian people. Indeed, the sacrifices in the eighties which Canadians will have to face are very vast.

I should like to compare the plight of the Canadian worker to that of the Canadian farmer. The government has driven people from their jobs because the jobs cease to exist as a result of the poor economic planning of the government. The same thing is happening in western Canada, and perhaps in many parts of eastern Canada, but I am more familiar with the west. Farmers and people in the agricultural industry are being driven off the land. We talk about removing the Crowsnest rate. It is very crucial to Canadian farmers so that they can move their products from their farms to the markets at a reasonable and statutory cost that was locked in many, many years ago. It was to provide farmers and people in agriculture with a break.

The Crow rate has been paid to the railroads many, many times. The railroads have received concessions in terms of rolling stock and actual lines being paid for in subsidies from the government. As well, they received large holdings of lands, and now at least Canadian Pacific is a company which does not really care about moving the products of farmers to the markets. It cares more about the lands it received in concessions to keep the Crow rate. It has built huge real estate firms and travel agencies at a cost to the Canadian taxpayer and Canadian farmer. It no longer wants to accept its responsibility, in terms of the Crow rate, to move products to the markets.

Some say that if the Crow rate were removed it would help farmers because the rail companies would be more in tune with moving the product and would be paid a fair consideration for it. We in the New Democratic Party say that the rail companies have been already paid a fair price for moving the products of farmers. In fact currently they are paid subsidies from the Canadian government to move that product.

If the Crow rate were removed, there is no assurance at all that the product would be moved any more effectively than in the past and than in fact it is being moved today. For example, in the Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency, to move a hundredweight of wheat to the ports would cost a farmer about 26 cents. For a comparable distance in the United States it would be six times that amount. It would cost farmers in the United States six times that amount to move it from their farms to the ports, and they do not have any better movement of grain or products to the coast. As we are driving workers from their jobs in many parts of Canada, also we are driving