

*Crown Assets Disposal Corporation*

heard about it until I walked in just now. But if there is such a disposition, we can deal with it now. I apologize and I will make it up to the Hon. Member in some other tangible way, if he can accommodate us today.

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** We certainly have no objection to the substance of the legislation and I made that point to the Minister earlier. I am simply surprised that the Hon. Government House Leader would have the idea that there was agreement. I do not think there was any agreement. We can try to develop one on the floor of the House. However, I would hate to see agreements being put to us when they have not been concluded. This being said, it would be nice, this being a TGIF Friday.

**Mr. Fulton:** Perhaps I can clear the matter up a little, Mr. Speaker. I did have brief discussions with the Government House Leader (Mr. Hnatyshyn) and with the Minister. I do not object, although I have not been privy to the discussions which were held between the Opposition House Leader and my own House Leader. I think the agreement was that the Bill would go from here to committee, but from what we have heard this afternoon, I believe the Minister has answered the concerns which have been raised in the House this afternoon and, at least speaking for myself and my colleagues, I do not object to our proceeding. I think it is a good Bill.

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, let us deal with it in Committee of the Whole and let us forget about the clock. Perhaps we could get unanimous agreement to go a few minutes past four o'clock so that we can deal with it. Perhaps we can have the agreement of the Hon. Member who is coming up with Private Member's legislation.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Mr. Andre, seconded by Mr. McKnight, moves that Bill C-43, an Act to dissolve the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation and to amend the Surplus Crown Assets Act and other Acts in consequence thereof be now read a second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

● (1600)

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Danis in the Chair.

Clauses 2 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—PUBLIC BILLS**

[Translation]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for the House to proceed to Item No. 169?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971**

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie)** moved that Bill C-221, an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to rise in the House today and speak to my first Bill, which consists in amending certain sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971.

I had very specific reasons for proposing this Bill. First of all, the Bill is aimed at correcting a situation which, I feel, has led to a double standard. Let me explain. Today, when a person applies for a course with his Manpower counsellor, they take his application form and invite him to an information session where they start off by telling him he should not expect to be on a course the next day.

It's true! I know someone who applied two years ago and is still waiting. Then they tell him that if he does not have an income, he will get about \$85 a week or more, depending on his status. He will also be told that he may work. If he does not work more than 25 hours a week, he may earn as much as he wants. If he is unemployed, he will be given what he is entitled to and the course will be paid for by the Employment Centre.

I know someone else who was working as a waitress without tips, who was on her feet all the time and had a constantly changing schedule. Her doctor strongly recommended that she stop doing this kind of work, for health reasons, and she wanted to get a better job. For her, the answer was to take a course in a subject that would suit her, such as typing and work processing. Her boss refused to let her change her hours, so that she could work and take a course at the same time. She left her job to take this course, which is from 11:45 a.m. until 3:45 p.m.

This woman, who is paying \$1,000 for her course and who is still looking for another job has lost her unemployment insurance benefits and is being penalized because she had the courage to leave her job to take a course and make a better life for herself.