

Government Orders

The other point that the hon. member made is that it is not fair for people who are working—and here we come into the mentality of this government—to pay UI premiums for those who quit without cause.

• (1700)

If we are talking about the .01 per cent who are in fact found to be abusing the system—.01 per cent is the government's own figure—then we could talk about the 2 per cent, this caused the big debate in committee recently, of members of the opposite side of the House who had been found guilty in the courts.

I think that the hon. member probably should get up and apologize to Canadian women for his total lack of understanding for the kinds of difficulties that Canadian women are facing in this country and their need for unemployment insurance.

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): I would like to ask my hon. colleague who has spoken so eloquently on this bill and particularly on the lack of justice for women, particularly women who suffer from sexual harassment in the workplace, what she thinks is the reason for having a section in this bill where such women who have suffered from harassment in the workplace could be excluded from their own hearings on this? They could be excluded from giving testimony on their own behalf.

Why is this included in the bill? Does she think that this is just?

Ms. Langan: Hon. Speaker, I wish I could have the opportunity to ask somebody, one person on the other side of the House, that same question.

I think it is important that this question is raised and I thank the hon. member for her question.

Of course it is not just. Have we any courts in this country? I outlined in my speech some of the analogies between a court of law and the UI system where criminals get fairer treatment in a court of law than if one is somebody in this country who is thrown out of work.

Now we have women in this country who have been sexually harassed who do not have the right to appear on their own behalf in a hearing on their sexual harassment.

It is absolutely bereft of justice. This government does not even pretend to be a just government when it comes to women in this country.

Mr. Kristiansen: Political fraud.

Ms. Langan: My colleague has said "political fraud" and I think that probably is a good way of putting it. It is absolutely unjust, unfair and unqualified harassment of the Canadian unemployed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I think at this stage if the hon. member did say something that was unparliamentary I wish she would get up and apologize.

I believe I heard something that was unparliamentary.

Ms. Langan: I do not think what I said is unparliamentary but certainly if I did say something that was unparliamentary I am terribly sorry.

[Translation]

Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity today to comment on Bill C-113. I hope that my comments will clarify the debate and help some groups and individuals who have concerns and questions, to better understand the objectives and the thrust of Bill C-113 which we are debating in third reading today in the House of Commons.

We have to go back to December 1992 and read once again the statement that the Minister of Finance, made in this House concerning Canada's fiscal situation. We must examine in particular the measures which that economic statement would put in place in order to correct the situation. The minister's economic statement had essentially two objectives: first, to put in place measures which would help reduce and control government spending, and second, to introduce incentives for economic renewal and job creation.

• (1705)

The incentives put in place by the economic and fiscal statement of the Minister of Finance were designed specifically to aid and support small and medium-sized businesses in Canada and to allow them to create additional jobs, to diversify their activities and to have access to new markets in order to confirm the already existing jobs and to hire new employees.