

2. It is the intention to introduce new small arms weapons in the mid-eighties.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PURCHASE OF MICE

Question No. 974—**Mr. McKinnon:**

Is the Department of National Defence buying \$15,402 worth of mice and, if so (a) how many mice (b) is this as a result of a request by NDMC and, if not, how was this need established?

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):

Yes. (a) Forty to sixty male mice three times a month for a period of 12 months for a total of approximately 1,800 mice.

(b) No. A supply of a special strain of mice is required in support of a research project in operational medicine at a Defence Research Establishment.

DIEMACO INC.—KITCHENER—CONTRACT—SPARE PARTS FOR SMALL ARMS

Question No. 1,052—**Mr. McKinnon:**

Did the Department of National Defence let a contract with Diemaco Inc. of Kitchener, Ontario, concerning spare parts for small arms for \$154,653 and, if so, for which types of small arms?

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Yes. The contract is for spares in support of 9mm pistols and 7.62mm rifles.

CARLETON UNIVERSITY—CONTRACT—OFF-ROAD PERFORMANCE OF TRACKED VEHICLES

Question No. 1,053—**Mr. McKinnon:**

Did the Department of National Defence let a contract with Carleton University for the development of a method for predicting the off-road performance of tracked vehicles for \$363,408 and, if so (a) which off-road tracked vehicles are being studied (b) does the Department have a DRB or DRE section which is capable of performing this work (c) does the university have a department or research unit experienced in this field and, if so, what is its name?

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Yes. (a) No specific vehicle. The method studied is for generic tracked vehicles. (b) No. (c) Yes. Transport Technology Research Laboratory.

[English]

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Notices of motions for the production of papers.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Collenette: I would ask that all stand, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Stand. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, June 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy that Bill C-3, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I should like to take part in the debate on Bill C-3, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971. The concerns I have regarding this bill are twofold; first, that it places the full onus for recovery of the benefits on the premium payers, those who suffer the effects of unemployment; and second, that it extends to 1982 the variable qualifications, and whether or not you qualify for unemployment depends on where you live in Canada.

The real concern I have is with regard to the placement of the total onus upon the premium payers, the people who are suffering the effects of unemployment, when it is actually the responsibility of the government. Locked into the legislation which was brought in in 1971 was a clause stating that once unemployment grows over 4 per cent it would be the full responsibility of the government to absorb the costs borne by people who suffer from unemployment. I think that that clause should still remain the same today. Unemployment of up to 4 per cent is reasonable, but responsibility for anything over that should be accepted by the government.

I do not know whether the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gray) should be blamed for his ineffectiveness in dealing with the Canadian public and his inability to bring in an industrial strategy or some kind of an economic policy to keep people working, or the cabinet should be blamed for not allowing him to proceed with measures which would create work for the Canadian people or, at least, if not to create work, to allow people to hold on to jobs which they have right now. We are looking at higher and higher rates of unemployment each day as the auto industry is sliding into the greatest depression it has ever experienced. We see the ineffective measures of the government and the inability of the government to take action in western Canada where not only jobs are not created but jobs are taken away.

I think it is the responsibility of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to put the country back to work. We should not be looking to the lonely ministers in the west, such as the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr.