

through the red tape as slowly as ever. The following year, he took the same job, with the same employer. I have all the information here in front of me. We will have a good laugh in the federal court. The following year he submitted his application, the Commission officials accepted it and paid the benefits. They paid, but they paid in a funny way. They declared he was eligible for benefits, but they withheld the cheques he was entitled to, for the refund of the excess payment they had made the preceding year. Have you ever heard of such inconsistency? I have at hand a letter from the Minister of National Revenue (Miss Begin). We wrote the minister to find out if those jobs were insurable or not. This is her answer, I have it here. I have sent it to them in Rivière-du-Loup. I brought it recently to the attention of the umpire's registrar but they keep collecting though. The amount has been decreased a little: they collected \$1 a week for three months. Imagine! How foolish it is, for the principle's sake, to collect from him \$1 a week when there is still \$570 to collect; they will not collect it because they do not have the right to do so. Then they will have to give him back what has been collected, that is for sure.

● (1540)

Here is what the Minister of National Revenue wrote on April 29:

I thank you for your letter dated February 26, which has been referred to me by the President of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. The interest you are showing for the insurability problem of the workers specialized in logging operations is appreciated. Interpretations have been issued by some employers in 1976 to the effect that tree harvester operators did not have an insurable job because they were not hired under a hiring contract as required by Section 3 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. However, having considered additional information subsequently provided by these firms, my officials reversed their previous interpretations. As a result, the Unemployment Insurance Commission has been advised of this new decision, and I am confident that these workers will recover their entitlement in a very near future. I hope that this information will enable you to give a satisfactory answer to your constituents, and I regret any inconvenience they had to bear.

Just imagine! The Commission guys keep trying to collect from my man here, Charles-Émile Lagacé. They do not understand. They and the income tax people are going to tell me, as I said on the phone this week, that this is a decision from the minister. Yes. This may mean something but the act is there and civil servants proceed according to the provisions therein. Have you ever heard anything so crazy? The Minister of National Revenue and the bureaucrats under his authority admitted themselves they had made an error of interpretation and that everything would soon be corrected, but it has not been yet.

What does Bill C-27 provide to correct such nonsense? Nothing. That is why I am against it. And I am even very surprised that there are not more opponents. I commend my friends of the NDP who seem to grasp the situation and are

Employment and Immigration

making tremendous efforts to persuade the government that this bill should be modified. But I am surprised indeed that there are so few others like them. I guess this can be attributed to the general desire for our summer recess. Indeed, some are dying for a vacation, but that does not mean we must let a bill through that is going to do so much harm to a great number of unemployed workers.

I have here another case. It is about a 63 years old fellow. I know him very well. He had the misfortune to be ill and after undergoing the necessary treatment, he submitted a claim for sickness benefits. He received his 15 weeks allowances. And after he had recovered, he applied for regular benefits. He was told that he needed a medical certificate stating that he had actually recovered. Therefore, he went to see his doctor. Doctors are getting tired of filling in all these Commission's forms.

If you were aware of some of the telephone conversations a doctor back home has had with an employee of the commission, you would be surprised, because there are all kinds of requirements. One would have to write whole pages to say such things as: Yes, the man was sick, but now he feels better and could do light work. He could go to work. The doctor would have to say that. Then, though it does not make much sense, I always advise the man to get a doctor's certificate. He has one. I have it here, in front of me and I quote from it: I hereby declare that Mr. Castonguay has been fit for work since January 20, 1977. But there again, his own doctor is speaking. For crying out loud, why be picayune about that too? That is not enough, you have to see an independent doctor. And so the correspondence starts all over again. It takes an awful lot of time. The odd storm comes up too, once in a while. Finally, the man goes to Montmagny. Saint-Pamphile is quite a distance from Montmagny. So, he sees a doctor there. This doctor sends his certificate to the Commission, but by now it is March 21. During the whole period from January to March 21, he has not been eligible because someone did not trust the certificate he had obtained from his own doctor.

Let us see what the board of referees say about the procedure. That is why legal aid lawyers were insisting so much and so rightly saying that boards of referees should be made up of competent people who know what the law is about, people who can determine with a sound judgment whether a claimant is in his right or not. I often go to the board of referees. It is a place I find very funny—always unanimity, never any dissension. Those guys sure get along fine.

I note from the reaction of the labour representative that he seems to agree with what they tell him because that makes a lot of sense but the decision is always unanimous. Fortunately, decisions are overruled but sometimes I note they are not and I find it quite strange that there should not be any dissension. It is so easy. I personally sat eight years on UIC boards of referees and when I found that the chairman or the management representative was going too far, then I would record my dissent. That allowed the unemployed or his representative to