

Canadians will have access to training courses because we have taken steps to provide the necessary funds to help these workers instead of simply giving them an unemployment insurance cheque.

I would like to answer all his questions, since he had several. The hon. member refers to possible collusion between employers and employees on completing termination forms. I would suggest the hon. member re-read Bill C-21, which provides severe penalties for employers in case of collusion. We have investigators who are constantly on the job. Last year, more than \$280 million was recovered by investigators in cases of collusion and fraud.

As for the CIP worker who had worked for 25 years, I must say these points have already been raised. In this particular case I would suggest the hon. member take another look at Bill C-113 because it contains certain adjustments that deal with the type of case the hon. member just mentioned.

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Madam Speaker, what really surprises me in the speech made by the hon. member for Terrebonne is his insensitivity and lack of understanding of the issue. The hon. member essentially tries to interpret everything regarding the unemployment problem. We know that the unemployment insurance officer makes the final decision. This officer interprets the law and is both judge and jury. This, in my opinion, is a major flaw.

• (1700)

I want to ask the member for Terrebonne how he can guarantee fairness, understanding and sensitivity to the workers when the form which must be filled out to indicate why a person is leaving his or her job is completed and signed by the employer. The employee has no say in the process. He cannot see the form which is then sent to the unemployment insurance officer who, as I said, becomes both judge and jury. The employee who surely quit his job for a good reason is a victim in this process.

**Mr. Robitaille:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, which is much more interesting than the one from his colleague in the Bloc Québécois.

### *Government Orders*

I would point out to my colleague from the Liberal Party that it is totally wrong to claim that the officer who will deal with the case will simply base his decision on the employer's version as given in the termination of employment form. If my colleague bothers to check his documents and Bill C-113, he will see that from now on the unemployment insurance officer will have to take into account the written versions of both the employer and the employee. If the officer really cannot decide on the basis of these two versions, the employee will get the benefit of the doubt and that is clearly stated. I conclude by saying that it is insensitive to let the deficit of the unemployment insurance fund grow and put in debt those who will follow us.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa—West):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak against Bill C-113. I will begin with this question: What is the situation in Canada during this long, cold winter of 1993? What is the reality which Canadian workers face? The reality is that 1.6 million people are without a job. More than two million people must rely on social assistance to survive and feed their families. There are some five million Canadians who suffer from high unemployment and the lack of jobs in our country, one of the richest in the world.

[English]

In light of the desperate situation for over five million Canadians what does this government want to do? It wants to make life harder for those living through this hard and miserable winter without a job. It wants to say to them that if they lose their jobs through no fault of their own it will be cutting the already miserable income they have to live on to pay their municipal taxes, pay their mortgage, pay their rent and buy food and clothing for their children. It is doing more than that. It is telling them that if they quit their jobs it must be their fault.

I would like to ask people on the other side of the House who have very generous salaries, as I do, if they really think that someone earning \$18,000, \$20,000, \$25,000 a year is going to voluntarily quit a job to earn half that amount of money on UI. Do they honestly think someone earning that kind of a salary is going to quit a job and wait between two and three months to have any income whatsoever? Do they think Canadians believe that?