

have had 33 seats and will now have only 31. That is fewer seats than there are in Calgary and Edmonton, thanks to the Conservative Government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 22

[English]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, when is the Government going to tell Canadians the truth about unemployment in Canada? It continues to boast smugly that jobs are being created, but it is not stating how many good jobs are being lost. It is not saying that full-time jobs with benefits are being replaced by part-time jobs without benefits. It is not saying that the number of Canadians who are unemployed for more than a year and are without the benefit of unemployment insurance is double the number who were in that situation in 1982, and four times the number in 1981.

The Government will not say that most of the provinces, the trade union movements and many national organizations have serious reservations about the Canadian Jobs Strategy. The Gallup poll published on September 23 indicated that 66 per cent of Canadians thought that unemployment should be the Government's top priority. This indicates that Canadians have no confidence that the Government's Budget and economic policy will do the job. That is why the Conservative Party has lost 18 per cent in the polls and why 52 per cent of Canadians are not satisfied with the Conservative Government's performance.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) will be attending a federal-provincial conference in Halifax later this week. That will be an opportunity for him to reconsider the Government's unemployment policies and finally do something meaningful about this most serious issue.

S.O. 22

PUBLICATIONS CANADA

MAIL RETURNED TO SENDERS—"ADDRESS UNKNOWN"

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I am concerned and my concern is growing daily about the course the Government has charted and the confidence that Canadians have in the direction that has been set. During a recent visit to my constituency it became clear that my concern is shared by others, including many young Canadians.

A number of students in Miss Peschik's grade five class in Chase, British Columbia, were studying Canada and the Canadian Government. It was not clear to them just what direction the Government was taking on a number of issues so a number of the students, including young Richard Velestuk, sent requests for Government publications to Publications Canada located here in the nation's capital—or so they were led to believe. In each case the self-addressed request cards, printed and supplied by Publications Canada of the Government of Canada, were returned to the students with the ominous message: "Addressee moved, address unknown" stamped on the front.

I was pleased that Richard and his classmates saw fit to bring this matter to my attention but, frankly, I am worried about the kind of signal that the Government has sent to this class of young Canadians. What does this say to these young Canadians about the Government's ability to manage its responsibilities and obligations to the citizens of the country? Where is the Government going? This class of young Canadians might reasonably be expected to ask themselves where the country is going, or where it has gone. Should it not, at least, leave a forwarding address?

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

EFFECT OF TAX CEILING REMOVAL

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, there is a 9 per cent tax on airline tickets bought in Canada for travel within Canada. Effective September 1, 1985, the \$30 ceiling on this Canadian air transportation tax was removed. This removal greatly affects western Canadians. By way of example, Toronto represents the largest point of origin or destination to and from my Province of Saskatchewan. The removal of the ceiling adds between \$20 and \$24 to each return ticket between Saskatchewan and Toronto. With the removal of the ceiling the basis for the tax becomes distance related—the longer the haul, the greater the tax.

The removal of the ceiling is inequitable because those Canadians living in more remote areas bear all of the increase, while commuters in the corridors between Montreal, Toronto, and Ottawa are not in any way affected.

Deficit reduction is very necessary and this measure would generate some \$55 million annually. I suggest, however, that those in the more remote areas ought not to bear the entire increase. The additional revenue can be gathered through a