

*Government Orders*

Mr. Max Yalden, who is the commissioner of human rights, appeared as a witness before the committee and on this question of accumulating statistical information said:

I would suggest finally that whatever system is put in place to deal with the situations I've been describing should include some means of recording and categorizing the number and nature of voluntary quit claims, especially where harassment has been in question and how they have been disposed of, and second, the provision of some form of overseeing body, which will periodically verify those data and report on how successfully the regime is dealing with so-called just cause claimants.

Here you have two witnesses. First, the Unemployment Insurance Commission admitted it has just guestimated and it really does not keep the statistical information on the reasons for the 190,000 not just cause disentanglements. The commissioner of human rights suggested statistical information should be kept. What did the Unemployment Insurance Commission representatives say? They said it was a good idea and as of April 5, they were going to incorporate the system. It seems to me it is putting the cart before the horse. These changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act should be held in abeyance and we should develop the experience with the reasons why people quit their jobs.

• (1645)

We have to look at the reasons, not fly blind and come in with amendments. The government wants to pander and cater to what it senses is a right wing agenda out there and wants to punish these people because, after all, we are in a deep recession and unemployment is high. Two million people are unemployed in the country. The government asks: "What do we have? We have people quitting their jobs. Oh, good heavens, we have to nail them. We have to show how tough we are with them". I do not think that is the way to legislate. A sensitive government does not legislate in that fashion.

My colleague's Motion No. 18. is an amendment that would make sure that the claimant cannot be excluded from a board of referees hearing. Can we imagine anything so ludicrous as excluding a claimant from a hearing?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. It being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier this day and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of report stage of the bill now before the House.

The first question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** A recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?