

Unemployment Insurance Act

to say that it should be the rich who should pay for the unemployment which they create.

If hon. members would like the article that I have here—

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would hope that the hon. member would attempt to be a little more relevant in his remarks. He has used a slogan which was used in the last election, that is, "Make the rich pay". That was a slogan of the Marxist-Leninist party. If he wishes to use it that is okay. However, I do not like to be called a Communist. We must draw the line there because I do not think the hon. member knows the difference between a Communist, a Marxist-Leninist, the CCF or the NDP. I think they are all the same.

● (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): On the latter part of the hon. member's point of order, I am sure we agree that it probably does not qualify as a point of order.

On the former part in which he expressed the hope that the hon. member be more relevant, I have already drawn that point to the attention of the hon. member. He does have a relatively short time left, and perhaps he might like to remind himself of the rule of relevance again.

Mr. Anguish: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was sure that I was not out of order.

I think that the people with the ability to pay should be the ones to pay. I have before me a copy of a list of directors of Canadian Pacific Limited. The chairman and the chief executive officer of Canadian Pacific Limited is Ian D. Sinclair who receives, in his capacity as the chief executive officer of that large corporation, in excess of \$600,000 per year. That is shameful, Mr. Speaker. People like that have the ability to pay. The poor small business people of this country who I mentioned are the backbone to the success of our economy, and the wage earners who work for them do not. Not only is that shameful, but Mr. Sinclair is also the chairman and chief executive officer of two other companies. He is the president of another company; he is the vice-president and director of three other large multinationals, and he is the director of 18 others. He receives remuneration for all of those positions. It is unbelievable that one person could earn so much. Most of it comes from political patronage, but that is irrelevant. Those are the people who should pay for the high cost of Canadians being unemployed.

I would like now to return to Bill C-3 and refer to the Speech from the Throne. The third item talks about Canadian ownership and control of the Canadian economy. We do not have much Canadian control or ownership of our economy because of the current policies of the Liberal government and the former policies of the Conservative government. There have been no attempts made to get control of the Canadian economy. There has been no attempt to do that, just as there has been no attempt to gain control of the spending that has gone wild under this Liberal government, together with the spending deficits which have increased for many years now.

This government will choose to talk about something called the Foreign Investment Review Act. How is this going to help Canadians gain control of the economy? Those Canadians such as members of the New Democratic Party who have a sincere interest in keeping Canadian people employed and not varying their benefits when they become unemployed in such high numbers across Canada want to know how this bill will help. These people do not know what their qualifications are from month to month to qualify for a program that an individual pays into and subsidizes totally, which is what this government advocates.

Small business has trouble dealing with this government. Many small businesses go bankrupt, just as many farmers have been driven off their land. We think that that is disgraceful. The government would rather place its priorities on a spending deficit in excess of \$16 billion—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I have to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have only three points to make in regard to Bill C-3. I wish to make these because I was unable to be in the House during the past debate. At that time I was conducting a housing tour in the maritime provinces where, as hon. members know, unemployment is at an all-time high.

My colleagues have said in other speeches that we reject this bill out of hand. It does nothing to help the whole problem of unemployed or the plight of the unemployed in Canada. It shifts the cost of unemployment insurance from government to employers and to employees. Indeed, it shifts the cost of unemployment insurance on to the backs of working people instead of dealing with the problem from the point of view of government, which is largely responsible for the massive unemployment that we have in Canada today.

The three points that I wish to refer to have to do particularly with the way this bill and the general unemployment insurance program affect women and young people in Canada. First is the whole question of the rights of part-time workers to unemployment insurance. Second is the question of workers, particularly women, who often work as partners in family businesses with their spouse. Third, I would like to refer to the scandalous revelation by the former minister of employment who is now the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey), which I read about in the Vancouver *Sun* for June 18.

First of all, I shall deal with coverage of unemployment insurance benefits for part-time workers. Apparently from the debate on this bill we have seen a change that would reduce the coverage of unemployment insurance benefits from a requirement of 20 hours of work to 15 hours of work. If I may use the term it is a rather pointless reduction because it does not get at the main issue. If this is an insurance scheme paid into by employers and employees as well as government, surely the benefits should be available regardless of the number of hours that a worker works? What difference does it make whether a worker works ten hours, 15 hours or 20 hours a month if the worker has paid into the scheme? Surely if the