Supply

of equity extending to those who have a mobile profession, such as people in the construction trade.

On the matter of the Windsor area, I must confess that it has given me some trouble. We advised the workers there that because of the obvious condition of lay-offs they would not have to show up. I am not sure it was sufficient to change the actual statistics because we did work through a three months moving average. StatsCan uses that kind of equation. I think a much more important factor was the fact that there were other cities and town within the statistical region which have very low unemployment rates, and this brought the average substantially down. It goes back to an issue which many of my colleagues here have raised with me, particularly those from Quebec and New Brunswick. I guess I have spent more agonizing hours as minister trying to organize those economic regions than I have spent on many other issues. Again this is an issue we are addressing in the unemployment insurance review. I for one hope we will find an answer to it so I can get some rest on that particular matter.

Finally, with regard to affirmative action, I want to point out to the hon. member that the question of mandatory or compulsory affirmative action is being examined by the government. We recognize that the voluntary approach which has been used so far has resulted in only 18 agreements in the past three years, and I personally do not consider that good enough. However, I do not think we were able to go to the private sector until we did something in the public service. We have now introduced a program in the public service and we can legitimately say, "We have started our reform; now you should take a look at yours". I made several speeches to business groups—not to overwhelming applause, I suggest, but at least they were interested in hearing that we will be moving in that direction.

I do think we should not necessarily move in the same way as the Americans are moving. I think we can improve upon their affirmative action program and I would like to do so in consultation with the employers and the trade unions. I think it would be a much more effective program if they came on our side in that program rather than having government enforce it upon them. So we are holding a number of discussions with them. It is something which I intend to present to cabinet within the next month or two for their consideration, but it would need a fairly long period of consultation to make sure that there was consensus on the approach, style and method of that affirmative action principle.

• (2345)

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I ask the minister to clarify whether he meant mobility grants when he was talking about the construction industry people or whether he meant tax relief for those who get reasonable expenses from employers.

An hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Dawson: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a real point of order. After 14-3/4 hours, I was wondering if we could have the

permission of the opposition that the next 15 minutes will be shared by the hon. member for Restigouche and the hon. member for Spadina.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Earlier the hon. member for Calgary West requested the unanimous consent of the House to divide that party's time into two sections and the same request is now being made.

Mr. Knowles: Agreed.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: If that is agreed, I will recognize the hon. member for Restigouche followed by the hon. member for Spadina for seven minutes each.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to join in a positive way with the previous speakers of today to second the motion and all the good things said about what is being done by the department, the minister, and as has been demonstrated today, by his parliamentary secretary.

When I talk about positive action, I am talking about all the good programs such as the community development program, young Canada works, LEAP, the Outreach program for the handicapped, LEDA in co-operation with DREE and various other projects. I might say I have the impression it might be an improvement to combine unemployment insurance with manpower once again. I want to take a minute to say something about that this evening so that the minister could have the department look at the manpower within the department in terms of the attitude of employees toward Canadian citizens who are required to go into these offices, whether they are soliciting help in locating positions or new employment, whether they are being placed through Manpower in new jobs, or whether they are applying for unemployment insurance coverage. Certainly this has been of some concern to me in the past. I do not want to generalize, but I am speaking specifically about the attitude of staff in some areas. It is important when we talk about a national government delivering these programs to Canadians to try to instill in the employees a sense of pride not only in their work but in the country, so that they can help with the whole question of unity and leave a good impression with those Canadians who go into these offices.

While I am listening as an elected member to requests from my constituents, all too often they comment on the attitudes of Manpower and unemployment insurance employees. I would suggest that some regional officers should get a little closer to members of Parliament. They should come out and meet members of Parliament in their constituency offices to find out exactly what are the comments of the elected representatives as to what they find and really feel about the manner in which these programs are being implemented.

Also on the subject of programs, I was somewhat distressed about the titles that are being used. I do not think Canadians need to be more confused about programs. I have noticed that throughout the bureaucracy we are using the word "community" all too often. For example, there is the community services contribution program, the Canada community services program, and now the community development program.