

the inability of multi-national corporations to embrace more than one responsibility at a time. He said that if a company is in one kind of business, it cannot undertake successfully another kind of business. The facts just do not bear that out. He referred to Bell Enterprises. I ask him to look at the way the market is judging Bell Enterprises. There is magnificent investor confidence in that firm and the multiplicity of its successful operations. If we look at Canadian Pacific Enterprises, we find that the same is true.

He referred to the business section of the *New York Times*. Let him look at the business section in *The Globe and Mail* and the report on Canadian business in the *Financial Post*, and he will find a rebuttal of the point he was making.

A very impressive example has to be Imasco. What does running a successful tobacco company teach one about running restaurants and fast food enterprises? One of the dimensions of its empire which made money for it a few years ago—

Mr. de Jong: Was the federal Government.

Mr. Stackhouse: No, no. Perhaps the Hon. Member—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 62(11) proceedings on the motion have expired.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Apparently the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod is a little bit late. I hope that all Members will stay so that we have enough people to go to the Senate for Royal Assent. I expect him to come along at any time. I hope we will all "hang in" to help. I am sorry the Senate is late again.

Mr. Speaker: We do not, of course, make reference to the other place. As the Hon. Member knows, we have no knowledge in advance of what is coming. I appreciate that the Hon. Member is asking Members to stay in case something happens. However, we do not need a quorum to do that.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—IMPACT OF CHANGES. (B)
REQUEST FOR A FREEZE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGES

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, on April I asked a question and made a request of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) with regard to changes that had been announced in the November 8 economic statement on unemployment insurance. On that occasion in April, I had

Adjournment Debate

hoped that the Minister of Finance would put a freeze on all changes that he had considered implementing under the Unemployment Insurance Act. How long is it going to take?

This is the second time I have been interrupted.

Mr. Speaker: If the Hon. Member would like to add a few words, I am prepared to allow it.

Mr. Dingwall: I had hoped that the Minister of Finance would be kind enough to agree with my request by terminating any changes whatsoever to the Unemployment Insurance Act. Unfortunately, that was not the case. The Minister, in co-operation with his sister in crime, carried on with implementing those recommendations as stated on November 8, 1984. They became effective.

These changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act are certainly not in the best interests of Canadians. Nor are they in the best interests of those Canadians who happen to be unemployed. I wish to make a point, particularly at this time, that it ought to be recognized by you, Sir, and particularly by government Members that when we talk of changes to unemployment insurance, we ought to remember the clientele which we are attempting to serve on behalf of all Canadians.

A change for an unemployed person with regard to his or her income is much more devastating than any changes which would be effected upon you, I or other individuals in society. To suggest to an unemployed person that he or she will have their income reduced over a period of time or that the requirements for qualifying for unemployment insurance will be changed, and changed unilaterally by this Government, is devastating both in terms of its spirit and in terms of its actual substance.

I want to say to the government Members who happen to be present today, although they are limited in number, that it is high time the Hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. McInnes) and the House Leader of the Conservative Party showed some compassion and sensitivity to those individuals who are unemployed in this country as opposed to implementing and suggesting unilateral changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act.

The Minister of Finance promised full consultation with all Canadians. Thus far we have not seen full consultation. What we have seen is a Government which is bent on reducing the deficit on the backs of the poor and the unemployed in this country.

● (1805)

I find it quite disturbing when changes to severance pay and vacation pay have been brought in without any meaningful consultation. I hope in the next number of days, prior to the budget statement, that government Members will for once represent their constituents and say to the Minister of Finance that there ought not to be any changes in the Unemployment Insurance Act until such time as full and complete consultations are held, not only with business, but with labour unions and all other Canadians, and that the House of Commons