

Department of Manpower and that is why we have unemployment insurance.

Now we have the Minister of Labour bringing a bill before us so that he too can become involved, so that he too can have a new bureaucracy involved with retraining and with determining which people he can categorize; determining if they should fall within the category of being capable of receiving some sort of special benefit or some sort of manpower payment.

There is no need for this bill. There is need for a better manpower operation. There is need for a little more attention to the facts of life in terms of business and career training and retraining. There may be people unfortunately displaced in our industrialized society who are over 54, as the bill says, who cannot be retrained for some reason and whom we as a society may have to look after. But is there any need for this great board of review? How many people are to be on the board? The bill does not say. There is going to be a board appointed which will make inquiries and which will certify whether a person who applies is eligible as a recipient. That person will receive what amounts to a UIC benefit; not quite, but 60 per cent of his insurable earnings as it is described in the bill. Without even being tied in with the Department of Manpower, it uses the same phraseology—insurable earnings.

What have we got here? We have another board to determine certain categories of people. How are the categories determined? They are determined by orders in council, presumably. It will determine employees who are redundant and who will perhaps receive 60 per cent of their insurable earnings for life. If there happens to be a mistake in the procedure and they receive more money than they should, their benefits will be garnisheed, they can be sued for up to five years of overpayment, their property can be taken from them. That is what is done with regard to unemployment insurance when that commission makes a mistake. If they pay a person a little more than he should receive under unemployment insurance, the benefits can be garnisheed and his property can be seized. They even send individuals to jail sometimes. The board is going to be able to do that in this case too.

We will have another whole bureaucracy lined up to do that. We will have another unemployment insurance bureaucracy under the Minister of Labour because this minister and his people want a bureaucracy too. After all, why should they not have one if the Minister of Manpower can have one? Why should they not have a bureaucracy in order to determine whether people are unemployable or redundant? Why should they not be able to shove them off onto the scrap heap and say: We will pay you 60 per cent of your insurable earnings for the rest of your lives, maybe, until you are 65 or until you collect from Canada Pension Plan, or until you collect your old age pension? That is how we are going to treat you. That is the policy. That is the way we are going to have it; another bureaucracy, another level of payments, another way of handling it, another way of shovelling people into an ash can. It is no good. We cannot as a society operate that way.

Labour Adjustment Benefits

Let us analyse what is wrong. First of all, in this country we have had a history of bad trade policy. The minister we have right now, the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) is the fellow who said this government is going to produce a low interest rate policy. He is the fellow who made sure we have had the highest interest rates in history. He is the fellow who said he would resign if interest rates went above 14 per cent. They went to 16 per cent, and he thumbed his nose at Parliament. They went to 22 per cent, and he thumbed his nose at Parliament. He continues to thumb his nose at the Canadian people. He is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who said, when it was suggested in the House that one of the problems with Admiral is that it was making microwave ovens and all of a sudden all sorts of these ovens were dumped on the market from Taiwan, Korea and so on, "You have to prove dumping. Too bad your people are out of work, Don; you have to prove dumping." That is the trouble with this doggone minister; that is the trouble with this government.

It is not a question of making sure there are jobs. What does he do? What did he do when the footwear industry came to him and said, "Just give the footwear industry a couple of more years' protection through quotas and it will be able to export leather footwear to the rest of the world?" The industry said it was getting tooled up to make the stuff and was getting good at it. That is what the industry said to him. What did he say? He said: "Well, too bad, you haven't got any quota protection anymore. We are going to let those people dump their footwear into Canada. We don't care about your industry. Let us have more people unemployed." He said: "I will tell you what we are going to do. We are going to give you protection for canvas footwear." Representatives of the industry said: "We don't make canvas footwear." He said: "Well, we will give you protection for canvas footwear." That is our Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. That is our minister of unemployment. That is how the minister makes sure Canada is rapidly becoming deindustrialized.

My colleague, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Jelinek), keeps asking the minister about Japanese cars coming into Canada. There were 60 per cent more this year than a year ago. What does the hon. member for Windsor West, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, do to protect Canadian jobs? What does he say? He says: "It's okay; don't worry, fellow. You know, the Japs are efficient. We will make your auto people redundant and maybe we will get the Minister of Labour to make auto workers, who have worked 30 or 40 years in the industry, eligible for 60 per cent of their insurable earnings until they are 65." That is the trade policy of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and that is the trade policy of this government. That is what is wrong with this bill and that is what is wrong with this government. The textile workers and the shoe workers are already under this kind of policy. But what are we doing to make sure that we produce textiles and shoes?