

against farm workers. Is the minister considering removing through order in council Section 16 at an early date?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the hon. member. I was called to the phone. I am sorry I did not have the chance to hear the whole tone of his remarks. I will look at the transcript of his remarks in the House this afternoon and give him the reply by letter at the beginning of next week, if that is agreeable. I would prefer to have his exact remarks before trying to reply in the House.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I have three questions for the minister. I will ask them quickly because I understand there is an agreement.

First, there are a lot of people unemployed. Many of them try to find jobs on their own. Sometimes when they find a job, they have to get to that job immediately, and it requires a move. Under the regulations, persons are supposed to make arrangements before moving in order to receive any moving assistance. I would ask the minister whether there is any flexibility, as many of those unemployed who find a job on their own do not have the chance to get to the unemployment insurance office first, as there are not that many in the country. Could there be some flexibility to encourage our unemployed to find jobs by offering them some assistance with regard to moving expenses?

Second, I want to reinforce the argument made by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton in connection with adoptions. Many of my constituents have adopted babies two, three or four days old. That is tantamount to having given birth to those babies. The department insists that a mother stay home with a baby for six months. Many can ill afford to do that. They have taken the child and given that child a name. Will the minister give consideration to amending the statute so that those adopting will receive some consideration with regard to unemployment insurance?

Third, I would like to mention a situation with regard to telephones in the Calgary office. Sometimes you phone and phone and phone. There is an antiquated telephone system in that office. Other government offices have switchboards. It is not necessary to sit listening to a busy signal minute after minute, sometimes up to half an hour. I would like to pay tribute to John Hodge, the man in Calgary. He does a good job. However, he is handicapped because of the telephone system. He has not told me that, but I know. I would like to see a switchboard installed in those offices where there are a great number of calls. This would help keep down the blood pressure of people, and they would not explode when someone finally answers the phone.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of mobility, we have a mobility grant program. I can report that that program has been used substantially more in the last few months than a year ago. It is designed for permanent, not temporary moves. There are certain conditions with regard to the distance one must travel. The reason we require a person to go through our office is so that we can verify that it is a

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 2)

legitimate move and meets the conditions. I will be glad to supply the hon. member with a more complete explanation. I am conscious of the clock; I do not want to take too much time. However, it is a legitimate question and he will be provided with an analysis of what is taking place.

I am glad the hon. member raised the question of adoptions. I receive a great many representations on this, not only from the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton but from many members of the House. These proposals were contained in the task force recommendations on reform. They are being kindly looked upon by my colleagues in government. We have not completed our recommendations. I can assure the hon. member that these are areas we plan to act on when we bring in the omnibus bill for reform to the Unemployment Insurance Act.

With regard to the third point of telephones, I cannot give an immediate answer. I will ask the deputy minister's office to look into this and I will get back to the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to tell us when he anticipates bringing in the comprehensive reform bill. There are a number of matters we want to deal with in the House.

The second matter is directly involved with the bill. Some time ago I wrote the minister about the situation that prevails with regard to the interpretation of being involved in a labour dispute and the problems that flow from that. Has the minister had an opportunity to look at the proposals for change in keeping with the case that he dealt with very well? It affected a number of employees in Hamilton during the Steel Company of Canada strike. Can we expect to see some change to that interpretation? Is he in a position to give us an indication as to what sort of change we can expect to see?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, on the first question, that decision is not entirely in my hands. We have gone through a full year of consultation, and recommendations are being considered by cabinet. Because of their extensive nature, we felt we needed a good deal of parliamentary time in order to give them proper examination. That would be a matter for the government to decide in terms of the next session and when the distinguished House leader feels we will be able to give the matter proper consideration. That is a matter for discussion between him, the hon. member and the hon. member for Yukon. We would be prepared to bring in our recommendation as soon as we can. Under the circumstances, I would like a clearer picture of what is taking place so that we can modify it to take that into account.

We established a committee of employers and trade union people to examine what changes can be made to Section 44 dealing with the unemployment insurance requirements during strikes. Their findings were not exactly universal or based upon consensus. My officials now have the findings of that committee and are preparing a report for me. If it is possible to arrive at something satisfactory for both sides, we will see if we can include it in the omnibus bill.