

adult education. They heard women's trade groups, women's training and education organizations, women's centres, status of women groups and groups representing mothers. They heard steel workers, nurses, construction workers; federal, provincial and regional civil servants, forest workers, miners, teachers, farm workers, hospital workers, builders, and fisheries workers. They heard representatives from railways, the petroleum industry, hospitality and tourism, the paper industry, mining and transport machinists, the automotive industry, banking, aerospace and the garment industry. On the development side of it they heard from developmental organizations; native, regional and municipal. You have to ask yourself how much more you want to hear before you go on with more consideration of this legislation.

The backdrop to that is that from 1982 to 1988-89 the government has looked at the Macdonald commission which, from September 1982 to November 1985, travelled the country for 74 days. It went to 37 different communities and by the end of its work it heard from more than 2,500 groups. Three of its research studies are on UI alone and seven chapters in the report deal with unemployment insurance.

Then we had the Forget commission which travelled the country for 60 days. It went to 46 communities and by the end of the study had considered 1,500 submissions.

Then we had the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration which, from December 1986 to March 1987, in Ottawa, heard 53 individuals representing 26 different organizations.

After that we had the de Grandpré report that did not hold public hearings but invited comment from all interested sectors. Over 160 briefs were considered.

You look at that and then you look at what the standing committee went through, the list I just read: labour, business, social, women, development and industrial workers from various sectors. How much more do we have to hear? How much more do we have to listen to on unemployment insurance? Surely there is a limit to what you can listen to.

Supply

The members opposite are using this as a ploy. They want us to say that we will set aside the legislation that we debated and was passed, legislation that is based upon all the studies that have been done by Macdonald, Forget, de Grandpré and committees of the House of Commons. They want us to push all that to one side and hear another 159 or so groups.

After Bill C-21 was referred to the Senate we heard first that they were going to travel across the country. Maybe they still are for all I know. It is their decision to do what they wish, but we heard that they were going to travel across the country. Then we heard another rumour that they were going to have televised hearings on this bill.

I think what really happened was that the Senate took a look at the legislation and said, "My God, if we don't pass this by the Christmas break, on January 7 this whole business is going to fall apart and a lot of unemployed people across the country are going to have to have 14 weeks of work before they can apply for unemployment benefits". Then, I suppose, they looked at a list and said, "Where is it going to affect"?

In Newfoundland it is going to affect the Avalon Peninsula, Fortune Bay, Gander, Corner Brook and Labrador. It is going to affect all of Prince Edward Island. In Nova Scotia it is going to affect Cape Breton, Cumberland, Guysborough, Halifax, Yarmouth and Kings. In New Brunswick it is going to affect Moncton, Saint John, Fredericton, Madawaska and Restigouche. In Quebec it is going to affect Trois Rivières, the Eastern Townships, Montreal, Gaspé, Quebec and northern Quebec. It is going to affect eastern Ontario, Belleville, Peterborough and other regions such as Georgian Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, northwest Ontario, Windsor and Sarnia.

We have put a bill in place. It handles the variable entry rate system very effectively. Any region that has unemployment in the 14 to 15 per cent range will still require just 10 weeks of work to qualify for unemployment benefits. That is in the bill and that is why the bill should be passed. There is no logical reason why senators should go through this little dialectic dance that they are going through in trying to convince people that this is some great horrendous thing.