

stand and help the unemployed. Unfortunately, it is not the case because of Bill C-69. We still have too many articles that will do nothing but complicate things for the unemployed.

It is already complicated enough so why should we not improve the legislation, make it more flexible, more acceptable, better adapted to needs? It is not the responsibility of the unemployed if the general economic system supported by the majority of the government does not create enough jobs for all Canadians willing to work. They should not suffer from a bad legislation which is not even adapted to their needs.

Bill C-69 includes amendments concerning the period of disqualification that goes up to six weeks for claimants who voluntarily leave their employment without just cause or who lose their job for misconduct or refuse suitable employment or have failed to apply for suitable employment that is vacant. Who decides if it is suitable employment? Commission officers or Manpower Centre officials should not be left to decide by themselves. However, it happens very often and they neglect to avail themselves of an opportunity to get suitable employment. If the man is broke he can hardly be expected to travel 25 miles to see if the job suits him. Apparently it is something that the civil servants or technocrats who draft the legislation do not understand. I guess they do not understand anything about it since they turn out legislation that is irrelevant or hardly applies at all. But in any case, it brings a lot of trouble to the unemployed.

In that respect, may I remark that it is not up to the Unemployment Insurance Commission to determine all by itself whether a job is suitable or not, and that it is not normal either for the commission to force a claimant to accept any kind of employment with any employer.

It is not normal, and it all depends on the officer the unemployed person will meet. I am not criticizing civil servants as a whole. There are some good ones among them. I usually say a number of them perform their task well, others are not as good, and others still are definitely third rate.

If the unemployed worker meets an officer who is unwilling to cooperate, imagine how difficult it will be for him to explain himself. The worker should have the right to know whether he is replacing somebody or if he will be in a new position. If he is taking someone else's place, he should be given the opportunity to know since when and why the job has been vacant.

Such matters do not seem to overly concern Manpower Centre officers. It would be normal for the worker to know also if there is an association of employees or a union in the corporation, and to be given the name of an officer with whom he could have an interview. He has to get organized. He cannot leave just like that to take an employment without knowing whether it will be interesting or not. He should also be told about the policy of the corporation with respect to working hours, and about overtime pay.

Surprisingly enough, when it comes to searching for employment, the Unemployment Insurance Commission does not seem to be satisfied that Manpower Centres are qualified enough, as it does not recognize the fact for a

Unemployment Insurance Act

claimant to have registered with a Manpower Centre and regularly renewed his job request as a job search proof.

● (1750)

Why do we have those fellows in Manpower Centres? They cost a lot to the Canadian taxpayers. I am not too critical of the organization as a whole but why? They should also be able to operate. Their only purpose is to take the names of the local people and say that in such an area there is no work, or to record names and maintain a file of what they call a "job bank" set up with posters that can be checked on the way in. These banks contain a list of jobs available in the area and outside but these people cannot indicate them themselves.

Last spring, there was a boy in my constituency who was very willing. To wit, he went to Alberta. Two of his friends were completing school at 17 and wanted to go to Alberta. I contacted the Rivière-du-Loup Manpower Centre to know whether there were accommodation for young people willing to work in an English-speaking province. They wanted to learn English at the same time. No there were no opportunities, no facilities, nothing doing. Well the boy, to show he was willing, came with me to Ottawa and I took him to the train at 9:59 p.m. one evening and he spent the summer in Alberta. He found work through his own research.

But the people in Rivière-du-Loup Manpower Centre get paid with taxes collected from every Canadian, and I am not referring only to those in Rivière-du-Loup. Unfortunately those are the facts. They did nothing to direct that boy to a job, although he was willing. He wanted to go, he did so, he came back and he earned a certain amount of money, all that on his own steam, without the help of government bodies supported by the taxpayer to guide workers to areas where they have a chance to find a job.

Secondly, I appreciate the reasons why the Unemployment Insurance Commission does not rely on facts supplied by the claimant who made regular applications to the Manpower Centre. The UIC say this is not enough. They must go to Michel Brochu and Diane Chevalier, they have to look on the spot, in actual areas where the unemployment rate now exceeds 20 per cent. People are having all kinds of difficulties with the present freight transportation system, for instance in the furniture industry, as concerns custom duties, in the leather industry, and therefore these people are not ready to hire new employees because they do not need them for the moment. They can only make reasonable profits to keep their present employees.

In these circumstances, why are the Unemployment Insurance Commission employees not trained and not given instructions to better understand the unemployed. Each time I go home during the weekend, I go to the arbitration board of Rivière-du-Loup. Why? To defend the unemployed of the area who have difficulties, and I hasten to say that the Rivière-du-Loup office is not any worse than the others because it is staffed with understanding people, but they have to act on bad legislation and no effort is made to change it, and it is regrettable to note that a group of members, who seem in a hurry to leave, are passing such badly written legislation and are leaving the unemployed to face all the hardships and consequences that follow a period of unemployment.