

the House. I hope those two changes will be brought forward quickly.

One of these changes would have the effect of increasing the amount of service required before there is entitlement to unemployment insurance. It is presently eight weeks. During the election campaign the Conservatives argued this should be increased to 12 weeks. That was their policy. What is needed is a cutback in the amount of benefits that are acquired after a small amount of service. In light of experience there is justification for giving only four or five weeks' entitlement after eight or 12 weeks' service, or whatever it is going to be. I think it is wrong to give 20 weeks of benefit after only eight weeks of service. That is an undue incentive to people who are only marginally committed to the labour force.

● (2130)

**Mr. Benjamin:** What does that mean?

**Mr. Kaplan:** "Marginally committed to the labour force" refers to an individual who works from choice and not from necessity.

**An hon. Member:** Sounds like a Liberal Member of Parliament.

**Mr. Kaplan:** I was glad also to see that the minister intends to do something about the regulations which apply to people who quit their jobs or who are dismissed for cause. Right now some weeks of benefit are lost, so there is a measure of disincentive if a person quits or is dismissed for cause. However, the minister has noted that the disincentive is not sufficient—there ought to be stronger provisions.

Back in 1972, people who criticized this aspect of the Unemployment Insurance Act were often accused of being against the working man. Some of us suffered unfairly under that label at the time. But today I do not believe it appears reactionary to be critical of the way in which unemployment insurance is working. I believe the working man, too, is critical of a system which allows someone beside him to quit, or be dismissed for cause, and then proceed, virtually on the same basis as the person who has been laid off, to claim unemployment benefits.

**An hon. Member:** Five weeks.

**Mr. Kaplan:** Well, two weeks goes for everyone. So the penalty is only three weeks, and that is not enough. I was glad to hear the minister say before the election he was prepared to do something about this situation. I can assure the minister that changes of this kind will be supported, not only by the business community but by the population at large who are disappointed that a small but important number of people have been abusing the unemployment insurance plan.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It is now 9.35 p.m. and I recognize that at 9.45 I shall have to call a division on this matter. For this reason I am reluctant to recognize an hon. member who has obviously prepared remarks of a duration longer than the eight or nine minutes remaining to us. It was my intention to recognize the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay) as the next speaker, but

### Division

rather than have him begin his speech and see it abruptly terminated I wonder whether the House would not be prepared to proceed with the division at this time, recognizing that the hon. member would technically be the first speaker on the amendment tomorrow, once we had disposed of the sub-amendment.

Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lefebvre:** With your permission, Mr. Speaker, might I say that the vote has already been announced—that the bells are to start ringing at 9.45—

**An hon. Member:** Let them ring that much longer.

**Mr. Speaker:** It would be the idea that the bells would ring somewhat longer so that no hon. member would be inconvenienced. The question is on the amendment to the amendment in the name of Mr. Broadbent. All those in favour of the amendment to the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the members.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Broadbent) which was negated on the following division:

● (2140)

### (Division No. 1)

#### YEAS

#### Messrs.

Alexander	Coates	Hamilton
Alkenbrack	Cossitt	(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Allard	Crouse	Hamilton
Andre	Darling	(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
(Calgary Centre)	Dick	Hargrave
Baker	Dinsdale	Hees
(Grenville-Carleton)	Douglas	Hnatyshyn
Baldwin	(Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)	Hogan
Bawden	Ellis	Holmes
Beatty	Elzinga	Huntington
Benjamin	Epp	Hurlburt
Blackburn	Firth	Jarvis
Brewin	Forrestall	Jelinek
Brisco	Fortin	Johnston
Broadbent	Fraser	Jones
Cadiou	Friesen	Kemping
Caouette	Gauthier	Knowles
(Villeneuve)	(Roberval)	(Winnipeg North Centre)
Clark	Gilbert	Lambert
(Rocky Mountain)	Gillies	(Edmonton West)
Clarke	Halliday	
(Vancouver Quadra)		