

Mr. Mulroney: When we had some particularly egregious statements in the last few days by the member for Hull—Aylmer and the member for Scarborough—Agin-court, I never once suggested that those reflected the views—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Both of them apologized.

Mr. Mulroney: They apologized—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Then that member should apologize.

Mr. Mulroney: —and they should have apologized because they were outrageous statements. I never once suggested that my right hon. friend in any way condoned that kind of statement. Why would my right hon. friend want to impugn my motives in this regard when I have already indicated to my hon. friend for Kamloops that it is my intention to read carefully the transcript, to speak to the member, and to have him respond at an appropriate time when he returns.

I did not know that my right hon. friend believed that simply because something is said outside the House that I would endorse it. Of course I would never endorse statements like that. I thought my right hon. friend would give me the benefit of the doubt as I have readily given him the benefit of the doubt in circumstances much more serious in the past.

• (1500)

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): The question was not raised as a joke in this House of Commons. If the Prime Minister is taking this issue seriously, can we take it from him then that he is going to require an apology from the member for Mississauga South when he returns to this House, on behalf of all members of this House, because he is representing us all as he is hearing public testimony across the country?

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, as I think he knows, I can assure my right hon. friend that any matter raised by my friend for Kamloops—Shuswap I take seriously. When he raises a matter like this, even though there was an exchange and some good humour between us, it does not in any way diminish the seriousness of the question that he raised and I will pursue it in that light and respond to

Oral Questions

my hon. friend as quickly as I can. I thank him again for bringing that to my attention because I had missed it.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saskatoon—Dundurn. I would ask him to make his questions very brief.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration, but in her absence I would direct it to the Prime Minister. The minister tells us that 30,000 Canadians will lose their jobs as a result of changes to the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The Canadian Labour Congress tells us that the number is 130,000, a difference of 100,000 claimants.

Even the minister's own estimates reflect the tremendous amount of misery that will occur because of these changes. Let us take one example. In the Avalon Peninsula, on the basis of Bill C-21, 10,000 Canadians will be dispossessed of unemployment insurance. I want to ask the minister how the government can possibly justify that kind of devastation to the Canadian public, and I would like an answer right now.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the statistics used in the study on unemployment insurance reform are correct, and I have every confidence in our statistics. They do, however, allow for the change in attitude we hope to see as a result of unemployment insurance reform, while the statistics to which you referred do not allow for changes in the behaviour of Canada's workers.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government spokesman whether he can inform us of the business of the House for the next few days and perhaps the bills he intends to bring to the House for consideration, and also give us some indication of the business of the House for the next few days, tomorrow and perhaps next week.