

Employment and Immigration

the common pot to see whether we could use moneys that are not being used in terms of job creation to create jobs.

We have also said that wage and price controls have been a disaster. There are many ways of looking at this, depending on what conclusion you want to reach. The Minister of Finance would like to stop the controls but he does not know how or when to get out. We say we should get out by the end of June, as I think was indicated in our motion. Our recommendations as to what to do during the post-control period, monitoring, and all that sort of thing, are all on the record. We are not talking about sharing the work which is available. I do not like it because it would be a retrograde step. I want to progress, and the only way in which we can progress is by attempting to create jobs for those who are ready, willing, and able to work.

It is a shameful indictment of our society that in a country like ours, with our natural and human resources, we are unable to provide jobs for some one million people. It is a sorry state of affairs. It is all right for us to sit around here. We are gainfully employed for the time being, although some of us might not be back after the next election. You know how many letters we get, not only from high school students but from people with doctorates, B.Sc., B.A., and M.A., heads of families and others. We have a national crisis of significant proportion in terms of the high rate of unemployment. People do not want to be on the dole, they do not want to go to the welfare office, they do not want to stand in line for UI cheques—it is demeaning.

I do not want to be partisan and I have not been partisan as yet, but I must say that the government has created a nation of "gimmies" It has spent money as if it were going out of style. It spent some \$10 billion in 1968, and \$45 billion in 1977. Why? Because it said that people want that. I tell you, people are starting to say, "Listen, you are putting your dirty, greasy fingers into our pockets too long and too deeply". We had better start listening to the people. That will be the end of my partisan statement, although I could go on a little further than that to say how the government has destroyed the country. But I will not say it now, I will save it for another time. There is the scenario of the just society, another myth.

An hon. Member: Let's hear about it.

An hon. Member: Tell us more.

Mr. Alexander: We have heard "I shall save the nation". We have heard about national unity. This government, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, has not only destroyed this country but has created a nation of "gimmies" and has brought into being a separatist government in the province of Quebec. That is the end of my partisan statement. That is the message I will take to the Canadian people. Never mind this nonsense, "I am the saviour, I am the only man who can save this country". The one man who did nothing for this country who will be remembered is the one man who destroyed it, and he is still sitting here.

Let me continue by saying that I will accept the minister's proposal for job training and job creation but I cannot accept

[Mr. Alexander.]

his work sharing concept. I hope he will appreciate the motion I place before the House to have this matter reviewed at the end of the year.

I notice that motion No. 13 is in the name of the NDP. We will vote against it, of course. We will also vote against motion No. 14 because that is another socialist motion. Motion No. 16 is in the name of our party, and of course we will vote for it. Of course, we will vote for motion No. 16 because it is a meaningful motion. As to motion No. 17, we will vote against it because it is NDP. Motion No. 18 is another good motion coming from this side of the House, from the official opposition, and we will vote for it. I do not think I have anything more to say on this point. I want to thank hon. members for their patience and understanding.

● (2030)

Some hon. Members: Hear hear!

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is quite a change in approach, doctrine and dogma to hear the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) after listening to the bombastic addresses from what we have come to call the little rascals around here. However, there have been many comments made yesterday and today in this debate, and I will probably have more to say at third reading because I think there is a little more leeway at that stage.

We found surprising support for the action we have taken on the variable entrance requirements from a member of the NDP this afternoon, and I would commend to him a reading of his own address. The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) in some areas saw fit to quote the Canadian Mining Association, but he forgot to read the paragraph in which that association supported the stand taken by the government on its variable entrance requirements.

Clause 41 of Bill C-27 contains three proposed new sections authorizing the developmental use of UI funds. New section 37 relates to work sharing, section 38 to job creation, and section 39 to training. The basic rationale underlying these proposals is to provide more productive alternatives to UI claimants while they are receiving income maintenance. To that extent I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton West that people do not want to be on the dole and that, if there is an opportunity to take some training, I think we have an obligation to provide it to them.

The original purpose of UI was to provide income protection to unemployed workers while they searched for suitable employment. This undoubtedly remains a fundamentally important purpose of the program. At the same time we all know that there have been dramatic changes in the economy, the labour market, and society, with the result that, for certain workers, immediate job prospects are poor. In these cases the provision of income maintenance by itself is not the most effective approach to the solution of their problems nor, indeed, to the problems of the labour market.