

I do not know whether I was out of order earlier when I was talking about youthful applicants; I am sure I was directing my remarks toward the qualifying period and the attitude taken toward the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I see no reason why this would be irrelevant to the bill or to the way in which some unemployment insurance offices are run. My hon. friend from Timiskaming mentioned earlier today that it seems as though the worst qualified persons in the office were placed on the firing line—the ones who do not know the act, and that all the frustration builds up from that point. It is true most of the complaints we receive come from people who are experiencing trouble; we do not get complaints from people who receive their cheques on time. But sending out or receiving cheques is not the solution. The solution is employment, but there is nothing which is likely to improve employment prospects.

The marriage between the Unemployment Insurance Commission and Canada Manpower—what a fantastic leap forward into the 19th Century—

Mr. Rodriguez: Forward into the past!

Mr. Blackburn: Yes. "Forward into the past", as my hon. friend says. If one talks to the average person employed by Canada Manpower today, he or she will say that this anticipated coming together of the two services is likely to make a mish-mash of the whole thing. As a matter of fact the departments have been brought together, in practice, for several years. Certain pilot projects have been going on at various places across the country for about a year and I should like to ask anyone on the other side whether this arrangement has resulted in a more efficient system or in more job placements. My information is that it has not. All it has done is to meld two bureaucracies into one. Instead of having to call surreptitiously from one office to another and say "John X is dogging it, cut him off UIC", he can be denied benefit more directly on the grounds that he is not looking for work when no work is available.

● (2120)

Bill C-27, along with the other bill I have referred to but which we are not discussing tonight, will place a tremendous burden on the social service agencies of this country. At the present time, if a person has to go from unemployment insurance to welfare, this is again one rung down the socially acceptable ladder of our society. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. The federal government is going to deny the unemployed benefits by increasing the qualifying period, and those cut off UI benefits, approximately 226,000, will be unable to find work. We are facing a fall and winter in which the experts tell us unemployment will become worse, not better, so where are these people going to go? A few of the young will probably be caught breaking and entering and be sent to correctional institutions, but the vast majority are law abiding and will end up on welfare.

Who provides the funds to pay for welfare, Mr. Speaker? Fifty per cent comes from the federal government, 30 per cent

Employment and Immigration

from the provincial government, and 20 per cent from the municipalities. So here we are, caught in this vicious circle. On the one hand, the Unemployment Insurance Commission, or the employment commission, or whatever they call it now, think that they will save the taxpayers money by cutting people off unemployment insurance; on the other hand the federal government, through transfer payments of one kind or another, will have to provide more funds for welfare. So how much further are we ahead?

This brings me back to my first point, which is simply that we can pass any piece of legislation we want in this House to help someone who is unemployed, but unless we create employment and stimulate the economy, what is the use? Why not let them line up again in the bread lines? In fact I am convinced that this government would finally get off its butt and act on unemployment if unemployment insurance were done away with and we had walks on Ottawa, and violence in the streets—which I am not advocating. If we got back to the thirties, in other words. But as long as Liberal philosophy prevails and we allow just enough money for this and just enough money for that so as to keep people from getting angry, the government thinks this palliative will save it.

The Prime Minister will then come along and tell us that the only problem with national unity is that we should be friendly with French speaking Canadians and French speaking Canadians should be friendly with English speaking Canadians. This will not happen through Bill C-27; it will only happen by providing jobs for Quebecers young and old, indeed for people right across the country, who will then find a common bond. Unless this is done, the anger of the people will continue to rise, not because Quebecers hate Anglophones or because Anglophones hate Francophones, but because of the regional disparity and poverty which exist in this country.

This bill should be delayed for six months, Mr. Speaker. It should be reviewed; it should be rewritten in part. That is why I have spoken tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, like the NDPs and the Socreds who spoke before me, I would like to tell the government to-night that I agree this bill should be postponed for six months, and this for several reasons.

First, it seems to me that Bill C-27 emphasizes the failure of the government to create jobs. When we consider the unemployment rate, the economic situation and Bill C-27 we can only conclude that the government has no solution to the problem of job creation in Canada, except tampering with the Unemployment Insurance Act, I would say. Bill C-27 is the admission of the government's bankruptcy. It means poverty and is officially accepted in some areas. I have been sitting in the House since 1962 and I have heard about regional disparities ever since. They said it was a shame that in that area there prevailed an unemployment rate which was higher than in other areas, and that the government was doing its best to solve the issue of regional disparities, while that same government filled our ears with their propaganda that one of the first priorities in their social policy was to stamp out regional