

will have my support. We will take a look at it Monday, but there is a long road of parliamentary reform ahead.

I am a perpetual optimist. I believe sometimes the leopard can change its spots and that suddenly out of a shroud of secrecy there will be a streaker of openness in terms of freedom of information. Where there has been closeness before in terms of parliamentary reform and a desire to keep government in control, I hope suddenly there will be a transformation to sainthood and a new plateau of involvement of Members of Parliament. If that is the result, we will all cheer. I will cheer with my friend. If need be, I will even buy a bottle of champagne which we can share together! It will be a bottle of Canadian champagne, by the way. I suspect, however, that many of the things we are discussing in terms of unemployment insurance as well as the economic program of the government would be different if parliament could have been involved.

I want to thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your kindness. You allowed me to proceed because you had also allowed the government House leader to do the same thing. As usual, you have presided over the House with the even hand and fairness we have come to expect of anyone from eastern Ontario who approaches that task.

I hope the minister will consider very carefully the question of adoptive parents, who have a unique problem. I also hope the government as a whole will bear in mind the new things that are happening in the unemployment insurance field.

I want to close with one further reference. I found an interesting clipping in *The Globe and Mail* which reports that the federal government is now setting up an ombudsman's office in Manitoba—I believe in the minister's riding—on a trial basis. I think that is very generous of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). The article in *The Globe and Mail* says that a new ombudsman would cut Unemployment Insurance Commission red tape. The office is being set up on a trial basis. I think it is wonderful the minister would do that for his riding. I do not know whether additional public servants will be hired for this, but it is a pilot project. It will cost \$200,000 in the first year and will be expanded to other provinces if it proves useful. That is what the article says. This office is now being dubbed the "Canada Public Help Centre". The article states the centre, and I quote:

—will open Monday in Winnipeg's Osborne Village area, and will be staffed by four advisers under the direction of Ted Wakeman, a 30-year veteran of the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

I, of course, wish him well in that new undertaking. The minister made an interesting observation about what this is all about. He said it is to "break down the barriers to ensure people get a sympathetic response".

The advisers will help people understand confusing government forms, and will patch up difficulties that occur when public servants have bad days and give their callers the brushoff—

Now we have an ombudsman for those who get the brushoff. What is happening is interesting. When the freedom of information bill goes through, we will have a freedom of information ombudsman. We now have a language ombudsman. We

have a penitentiaries ombudsman. We have a privacy ombudsman. We will have a UIC ombudsman.

If I may finish with this thought, I think the government should consider creating an ombudsman to report to this Parliament. There was a first-class bill in 1978, Bill C-43, which was advanced by the then minister of justice, Mr. Basford, which would have created the office of ombudsman. We cannot afford to have these little ombudsmen's offices all across the country. It would be much too expensive if we did it jurisdiction by jurisdiction, problem by problem and statute by statute.

The government's having gone this far, I think a case could be made now to create the office of ombudsman. I speak for myself only in this, naturally. If the government decided to move in that direction, I would be prepared to support it. I might even be prepared to help because what has happened in this country is that government has grown so large that in comparison the ordinary people feel quite small. I think we need help. Members of Parliament can help. Attitudes certainly can help. I think if this pilot project works out—the idea of a new kind of ombudsman is very interesting—the government should perhaps consider bringing in some legislation to create the office of ombudsman. It seems to me that should be the next step in this matter, the government's having gone as far as it has.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the House of Commons. I hope the minister will take to heart my comments respecting adoptive parents and that my friend, the government House leader, will reveal himself ultimately as the saviour of Parliament.

[Translation]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take part in this debate on the bill now before the House. I realize that we, the House leaders, have an agreement to get the bill through all three readings this afternoon. We are now engaged in second reading, and I shall therefore be brief, except to congratulate the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) on his present initiative to request an extension of the existing legislation, as he has done in the bill now before the House. My colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party, the member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), wanted to draw a parallel between parliamentary reform and the policies favoured by the government, and he implied that if our parliamentary rules were different, we would also be getting different policies, especially concerning employment. Perhaps he is right. I am not in a position to contradict his statement out of hand, but where he is making a mistake is when he is looking for scapegoats. I feel that even in 1982, it is rather presumptuous to accuse a few parliamentarians of being responsible for the very slow pace at which our noble institution is gradually becoming more modern. The hon. member knows this as well as I do. More or less as a joke, I said earlier that in a document tabled by the hon. member, there was