

the very day it became known that this man had been hired there were three graduate students in my office from Montreal asking for help in finding work. Everywhere they went they were told they were over-educated. They were told that if they were put to work today, tomorrow, next week or next month there would be a position for a university graduate and they would leave the job. We have Canadians walking the streets today who are told they are over-educated. They are graduates of our universities who cannot get jobs. This government brings people from Scotland into this country under the aegis of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and puts them to work in Cape Breton where there is an unemployment rate of between 29 per cent to 31 per cent.

I keep repeating that unemployment figure because if there ever was a government that needed, through repetition, to learn something about unemployment and other problems facing this country, it is this government. This is a government that runs advertisements in Paris newspapers inviting the educated to come to Canada, the land of opportunity. If this is the land of opportunity, it is time the government realized there are Canadians who are ready, willing and able to accept any opportunities that exist in this country. I believe in Canada for Canadians first, and I think it is shameful that this government brings in people from other countries to take jobs that could be filled by capable Canadians. There are hundreds of Canadians, many in Cape Breton, who are qualified to fill the public relations position at the Glace Bay heavy water plant. There are two men at the plant who have had years of experience in this field. What this government has allowed to happen is shameful.

The minister indicated he would not show any bias in respect of hiring a Nova Scotian or a Scotsman. Perhaps there is an historical bias because of the minister's Scottish name and background. The minister from Cape Breton suggests that what happened is all right because this man can speak Gaelic. I suggest that is absolute nonsense, I am against anybody coming to this country to take a job that a Canadian is able to do, and I do not care whether he comes from Wales, England, Scotland, Ireland or France.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. The hour set aside for the consideration of private members' business has expired. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

25316—39

#### *Election Expenses Bill*

• (2010)

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### ELECTION EXPENSES BILL

#### AMENDMENTS TO CANADA ELECTIONS ACT AND INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-211, to amend the Canada Elections Act and the Income Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, when this debate was interrupted by private members' hour at five o'clock I was in the midst of making it clear that we find this bill so disappointing that we feel it should not be proceeded with in its present form. Like the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) who spoke earlier this afternoon, we point out that there are so many deficiencies in the bill that it does not carry out its intent, which is to control election expenses and put the various candidates and parties on some kind of an equal footing at election time. Because the bill is so deficient, because it is merely a case of trading on the idea of doing something about election expenses, we feel it would be better to have no bill at all than to have this one. Actually, our preference is that the bill be stopped in its tracks and that the government be called upon to bring in legislation that will provide effective control over election expenses and establish a better approach to equality among parties and candidates.

Having said that this bill is deficient in that it does not carry out its intention, that it does not carry out the principle which is supposed to underline it and which we would be prepared to support, may I point out two or three of its deficiencies. As my friend, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), indicated on May 18, the biggest hole in the bill is to be found in the fact that although there are limitations on the expenditures of individual candidates there are no limitations on the expenditures of parties. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for all the good one can see in the effort that is behind this piece of legislation, that deficiency in itself nullifies the entire bill. What earthly use is there in saying that a candidate in an election can spend only so much money, if the provincial or national party behind that candidate can spend on his behalf without limit?

As the hon. member for Peel South also pointed out this afternoon, even the limitation that is imposed upon individual candidates is not as severe or real as it ought to be. There are figures in the legislation which by a process of arithmetic set a limit on the amount that an individual candidate can spend, but that limit applies only to the types of election expenses identified in the bill. There are about three or four categories of expenditures that qualify as the kind upon which there must be a limit. What earthly use is there in setting that kind of limit if ingenious candidates or ingenious parties can find all sorts of other ways in which to spend money at election time?