

Supply

Second, there is the idea that we are after the unemployed. Earlier, my colleague said, why are you going after the unemployed? Why not tackle the problem of unemployment instead? Has my New Democrat friend forgotten that, thanks to the initiatives taken by this government since Bill C-21, more than \$3 billion are now available to the unemployed in this country for training which will help them find a better job? Those are concrete measures, not just empty words. Why have we done this? We did it because we believe that unemployed workers do not necessarily want UI benefits. Rather, they want to find a good job through proper training and this is what we, as a government, are trying to provide for these workers.

I now come to the third and last point. If my colleague was serious when he talked about sexual harassment, he would not insult the victims.

Basically, what the NDP proposes as policy to fight sexual harassment is to pay unemployment insurance to the victims so that they will shut up. The NDP wants to pay those people to keep silent. If my colleague was at all serious when he talked about sexual harassment, he would ask the minister to implement a process so that from the time UI benefits are paid to a victim of sexual harassment, this process would enable us to go to the root of the problem. If the causes of this sexual harassment are not dealt with by the employer, if no corrective measures are taken, then penalties should be imposed.

It is totally revolting to use the victims of sexual harassment to oppose Bill C-105. Incidentally, when my colleague asks us to reject Bill C-105, he is also asking us to vote against his salary freeze.

Mr. Samson: Mr. Speaker, where do I begin? We are not talking about my salary here this evening; we are talking about a part of this bill. You have included this in a bill which covers several issues, in order to hide the impact of this legislation on the workers.

You asked me a question at the beginning. I am not sure if I understood well but I will try to give you an answer. If I did not understand correctly, I apologize. For several years, the person I was referring to had a job where there was discrimination of one kind or another.

That person decided to change jobs to get a better quality of life, better working conditions, better wages or whatever. For one reason or another, that person was laid off at the second place of employment, before having accumulated enough weeks to be eligible for UI benefits. On the one hand, the person could not work the required number of weeks in the second job to be eligible and on the other hand that person cannot go back to the first job because of leaving it without just cause.

Mr. Robitaille: That is false.

• (1710)

Mr. Samson: Well, if it is false, I apologize, as I said, but I do not think it is false. This is the situation as it exists.

[*English*]

An hon. member: It carries on.

Mr. Samson: No, it does not carry on. The fact is that if he does not, he cannot qualify in the second job because he did not work long enough. He did not leave for just cause. He has to prove that he left for just cause.

It is true. We can say it is true. It is not true forever and we are not going to agree.

[*Translation*]

That is the reason.

[*English*]

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the hon. member for Timmins—Chapleau is supporting this motion. He gave his reasons why; because many of the quotes in the motion are quotes from hon. members of the Conservative Party. They made these quotes in their home province of Quebec and elsewhere. I think this speaks very highly of them. It means that there are some members on the other side who do care for the unemployed. To show credibility, I hope they will stand up with us tonight and vote for this motion.

I am pleased the hon. member gave the example of someone shifting to another job for a higher paying job or to improve themselves on the job. It shows he studied the motion and UI bill very carefully.