

listen to those who are elected in the House and to the advice they get about what is happening in the country, even from within their own Party, and particularly reports that are unanimous. Several unanimous reports on immigration came out of the immigration committee to the Government, as well as reports on refugees and on unemployment insurance. These have been ignored. I suspect they have been ignored because the bureaucracy at the top has said, "this is too costly, this is impractical, this will not go and that will not go".

What I look for and what most Canadians look for in people who are leaders, and people who are in the Cabinet are political leaders, is leadership and courage. When I look across the floor, there is a vast shortage of those particular qualities. The Department of Employment is an example. One only has to read Victor Malaryk's book which documents the litany of problems within this Department. We mentioned, for example, the problems of unemployed people who are trying to get through to unemployment insurance offices to inquire about their claims, but they could not get through on the telephone because the phone was busy, busy for an hour. We complained about that. One would think that that is a simple, mechanical, administrative question.

People complained to the Government and voiced complaints to members who sat on the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration. These concerns were raised along with a whole host of other problems and recommendations for changing the structure of the administration, in other words, reminding the Ministers that money should be put in at the front end where you interface with people who need service. That is where the money should be spent, not on increasing administrative staff here in Ottawa.

What was the Government's response? The Government said that it would pick certain centres and put in a few more phone lines. But we are still waiting. If you put more lines in, it means you have to hire more people to answer the phones. It means that if you say service to the unemployed should be paramount, you have to deliver that service to the unemployed. I found that people have been hired only on term in the employment centres, and, regularly as clockwork, they get laid off and they go on unemployment insurance. Yet there is work there to be done. There is counselling to be done. We raised the matter of overwork of the employees, the competent employees, in those offices across the country who are striving to come to grips with a massive workload of unemployed young people going to employment centres who are given a form to fill in. There is no opportunity to have them sit down and be counselled. There are no opportunities for testing and no opportunities for trying to establish what is the best training program for this person.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there was a time when every woman who went into an unemployment centre looking for work was sent off to be trained as a hairdresser. Similarly all the men were sent off to be trained as stationary engineers. We had hairdressers coming out of our ears and we had stationary engineers we could line up all the way from

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971

Sudbury to Toronto. Then it was discovered that there were not enough jobs for them. As long as they were kept in a classroom and in a training institution for a couple of years, it kept them off the unemployment rolls. From that we went on to training people to be heavy duty machine operators.

Why is it that after Canadian Jobs Strategies have been put in place, community futures, the regions of Canada are still experiencing this deadening unemployment rate? Why is it that we still need a variable entrance requirement? In my experience, the unemployed people—as I go across the country and I travel through my own community—want to work.

I had a mother call me on the phone this morning complaining bitterly that her son has been out of school now for two years and cannot find a job. He went to the employment centre and there on the wall were jobs available in certain occupations, but they were only for people who were on welfare. I understand that is progress, but why do we need that kind of program? This mother saw that as clear discrimination against her son. Why is it that we cannot develop a program that creates employment for all people, not only for those on welfare? Why can this not be done? By tying in ourselves into a trade deal that will prevent future Governments in this country from involving themselves directly in planning and implementing programs for the benefit of Canadians, the Government has surrendered.

Mr. Thacker: That is not true, and you know it.

Mr. Rodriguez: It is true. Let me go through the steps again.

One, seven years from now people will sit down and devise what a subsidy is. In that seven-year period, we will have locked ourselves in even more closely to the American economy. That far down the track, there will be no way we can say that we do not like that definition of a subsidy, that we believe UI is not a subsidy and want out. There is no way we will get out.

● (1750)

Mr. Thacker: There will be no unemployment in seven years.

Mr. Rodriguez: Pardon? In that seven years, we will experience all sorts of harassments because the Americans will not have given up the right to countervail. They can continue to countervail, and the mechanism is really designed just to implement American law, not Canadian law.

I do not know where the Hon. Member is coming from. We know that the Americans have always viewed unemployment insurance as a subsidy. They have made that quite clear. They have just taken a breather, and in the meantime, they will be chipping away at it and we will live with their trade harassments.

I wanted to put those thoughts on the record, even though we will support this Bill. We do not want to cause greater