tion. Given the appropriate decision of his predecessor not to grant a general amnesty to illegal immigrants, and given the former and present Minister's intention to deal with these people on a case-by-case basis, however, they are going to do it anonymously—I can see that with a lawyer, given his solicitor-client privilege—is the Minister not concerned that where a Member of Parliament acts as a third party in an application and the application fails, the Member of Parliament is in the invidious position that he knows the individual, knows the law has been broken, and knows the person is here as an illegal immigrant and cannot report that fact?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member raises an important and rather difficult question. The procedure which we established is the one which was recommended by the Robinson Report in dealing with the problem of illegal migrants in Canada.

As the Hon. Member correctly said, the proposal put forward by some Members of the public for general amnesty was rejected. It was believed that special arrangements should be put in place to review on a case-by-case basis those which are brought to our attention. It seems reasonable to have a process by which people can bring forward their cases without putting themselves in jeopardy of automatically being subjected to the processes of the law in case the humanitarian review of their case is not successful. If there were not such provision, very few people would be likely to come forward.

My inclination would be to accept the responsibility of the Member of Parliament in this area. It would be similar to that of the lawyer-client relationship, in other words, acting as an agent for those who want to take advantage of this procedure. I should point out to the Hon. Member clearly that no one is given final entry anonymously. A recommendation is made on a set of facts alleged, and an indication is given by the committee that the individual meeting those facts would likely be accepted, subject to the ordinary reviews done on the basis of security and health.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CALGARY—ALLOCATION OF JOB-CREATION FUNDS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Employment and Immigration a question on behalf of the unemployed in the City of Calgary. It is Liberal Government policies which have destroyed about 20 per cent of the jobs that existed two or three years ago. The people of Calgary would like to know why the allocation of employment-creation funds is based on a four-year average. How does the unemployment rate in Calgary, four, three or two years ago, have anything to do with the need for jobs today?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Member is referring to the constituency allocations under the Canada Works Program. There is a common allocation base for every constituency across the country, a minimum level. The application of Canada Works funds above and beyond that is on the basis of a figure related to the labour surplus, not over four years, but over the past year. The four-year figure refers to the LEAD funds which would be allocated in that way from April on. In so far as the Canada Works allocations are concerned, which are those which would be applied in the Alberta area, it is not a four-year average which is relevant.

Mr. Hawkes: It is an allocation formula based on information that is four years out of date. I think the current situation should be the only criterion used.

CALCULATIONS BASED ON RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Employment and Immigration uses an 8 per cent rate of unemployment and characterizes it as normal. Labour surplus for Employment and Immigration is calculated as that rate which is above 8 per cent. Does the Minister of Finance agree with the Minister of Employment and Immigration that 8 per cent unemployment is normal and we just have to be concerned about that unemployment rate which is in excess of 8 per cent?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Immigration never made any such statement. I already answered this question on this very subject in response to the Hon. Member from Hamilton.

• (1150)

DISPARITY BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE INCOMES

Hon. Bill Jarvis (Perth): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. It deals with the report of the Economic Council of Canada, and particularly the Council's description of the disparity between the incomes of males and females in the work place, which it describes as follows:

—the size and persistence of the gap is striking, even within distinct occupational groups, whether measured in relative or absolute terms.

Does the Minister agree with that assessment of the Economic Council and, if he does, what policies or measures does he intend to put in place to reduce the gap?

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Obviously, Madam Speaker, this is a question which must be dealt with not only by my Department, but by several Government Departments. In light of the report of the Economic Council of Canada, I intend to raise the issue with the President of the Treasury Board and a number of other Cabinet colleagues to hammer out the Government position in that respect.