

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

Those who will support this recommendation are also those who supported the suggestion that a sponsor of a LIP program who designates his own work project should be entitled to qualify. In my opinion, these are the people who are able to set themselves up for a benefit period because they can initiate a program for a certain length of time by manipulating the size of the program, the number of people involved and thereby the duration. They are going to be entitled to benefits and nobody seems to worry a bit about that. In this case, the people can dictate the circumstances and set the duration of the project and even, in some cases, the amount of benefit to be paid.

Many of the people sponsoring these LIP programs will only be in the labour force for a short period of time. Many of the other people who are disqualified have good reason for quitting their jobs. Let me tell you about one case that came to my attention not long ago. A young fellow had what I thought was a fairly good construction job. I did not have much sympathy for him when he told me he had quit his employment. He was working out of town, making pretty good money, but he quit and returned home where there was no employment available. As I am sure most hon. members would do, I asked him why he quit his job. I was quite surprised by the reason he gave. He was working as a helper to a rigger on a high steel construction job and the rigger kept telling him that if he did not speed up and do this thing or that thing, he was going to throw him off.

He put up with this for two or three days until his nerves got the better of him to the point that he could not sleep at night. He started to feel that if the rigger did not throw him off, he was going to fall off. I asked him why he did not report this to the boss and he told me that he would have been fired anyway. He said it was that man's word against his and the rigger would be believed. I do not know whether he was honest, and I do not know whether the UIC officers might have felt he was honest. I felt this man should have appealed to someone on the job site to justify leaving his employment. However, he did not do so. Perhaps he could not. Construction jobs being what they are, the people involved are fairly tough when it comes to someone reporting on someone else. It is the kind of a job where, for one's own safety, one must get on with the people with whom one works because an accident might happen and no one would know whether or not it was an accident.

● (1630)

This person actually indicated he was afraid he would fall off or be pushed off. But he liked the job. He was willing to do that work or any other kind of work because he needed a job and his parents would not keep him. I do not know how one would assess this any more than one would assess the situation in respect of the waitress who keeps getting propositioned. Before she completes her probation period in the restaurant, she either goes out with the boss or is not accepted as a permanent employee. She may quit, and if so, how does she prove the situation that existed? I always believe what women tell us, so I would believe her.

The hon. lady opposite says that we need more female restaurant entrepreneurs. I agree. We continually hear about such cases. I might give another example. A man reported to me that he quit his job driving a truck because

the truck he was driving had defective brakes and his boss did not want to have them repaired. He said he reported this to the boss, who told him to either drive the truck or quit. He reported it to the office of the Department of Transport but nothing was done about it. I did not believe him because I do not think a person owning a \$10,000 or \$12,000 truck would operate it with defective brakes if he knew this to be the case.

**An hon. Member:** He must have been a Liberal.

**Mr. Peters:** Under those circumstances, an NDP<sup>er</sup> would fix the brakes before he sent the driver out with the truck. I made inquiries throughout the community. One thing that impressed me was the turnover of workers at that company. I spoke to people who said that the brakes may not have been completely gone, but that they were substandard and that all the equipment of this company was substandard.

I have given three examples of a person being fired who had difficulty proving the reason. I think these are legitimate cases. The minister will talk about the appeal procedure, and so on. It is not worth a damn. Everybody knows that. I do not think there is much difference, in respect of the tribunal, between the employer representative, the union representative or the labour representative. I do not know where these people are found. They are carried away with their own importance.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) is a little closer to these people than I am. Sometime ago I learned more about the appeal procedure than I had known previously. The hon. member for Nickel Belt spoke in very strong language to the members of the tribunal. It was interesting to note that of the 13 cases being considered at that time, the district director examined 12 of them and reinstated them after they had been turned down by the tribunal. I may be unfair to some people. I am speaking very generally. I am not referring to the particular representative of the hon. member for Nickel Belt, because quite often my representative is the same one.

When the hon. member for Nickel Belt raises hell, they start putting a "no" on it and it is not necessary to go to the umpire. A reference to the umpire should not be undertaken in respect of anything except an interpretation of the act. In my opinion, this should not be undertaken unless it is a matter of an appeal in substance rather than in respect of a specific case. What does this section say? It says that instead of penalizing the person, often wrongly, for three weeks, he will now be penalized for up to six weeks. There is mention of one week and up to three weeks, or from one week to six weeks. I shall bow to the superior knowledge in this field of the hon. member for Nickel Belt because I have not played around with that tribunal.

**An hon. Member:** What do you play around with?

**Mr. Peters:** I play around with the operations within the offices. Let me say to the minister, and to the hon. member who probably knows nothing about the subject at all, that my experience is that if the information is provided to the officials at the local offices, almost inevitably the correct decision will be made on the information given. If the information is not complete or is incorrect, then when it goes to the tribunal there is no new information. The hon.