

• (1850)

Moreover—and I did not hear this from the other side and I am sure some will intentionally avoid mentioning it—we give the benefit of the doubt to the claimant. Right now, things are not going well with the UI program. Bill C-105 will not solve all the problems which already exist. In his demagogic speech, the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, who has been here for 25 years, said that employers could drastically change the conditions of employment for workers. That is false. It is false to claim that those measures will have that consequence. Such circumstances are already recognized in precedents as valid reasons for quitting a job.

All those who came to protest in our offices—and I must repeat that those who came to my office were extremely nice; in fact, I will meet them again on Monday—said that they were better informed when they left than when they arrived. They will probably come to see me more often. It is a pleasure for me to meet these people, as long as there are not 200 of them arriving together, because our offices cannot accommodate that many, not to mention the disturbance for our personnel.

Another one said all week that employers will be able to fire union people. This is what the ad says because it is those people who organize the protests. That is false. Any person fired for those reasons is entitled to UI benefits. Under the Unemployment Insurance Act, such union activities are not defined as misconduct. Unionization is a right. It is wrong to make such claims. It is in today's ad. In fact, it is in today's issue of *Le Devoir* and it says: "Let's fight unemployment, not its victims." That is pure provocation.

A fifth claim says that the victims of harassment—I often hear that one—and low income workers will not be able to leave their jobs to find a better one. That is false. Any victim of sexual harassment will be eligible for benefits. This protective measure was put in place by our government. When a person quits her job for a better one, it is not a voluntary termination of employment. Listening to all those who have spoken on this issue in the past week, you would think that all employers now engage in sexual harassment. I wonder about an employ-

Supply

er who has 2,000 people working for him. He must really be busy. Sexual harassment is the only thing they can come up with. It existed before and it will probably continue to exist after Bill C-105 is passed. We only hope that there is less and less of it and that people do not make abusive claims of sexual harassment. It is always the bosses. Do you think that an employer with 2,000 employees has control over absolutely everything? He probably does not even know his employees. I was a boss for 25 years and I can assure you that I often did things to please my employees, even though at times we were at the limit of legality and the legislation protected the employee more than the employer. You know, sometimes you have to buy peace.

Certainly there has been abuse. I have witnessed it in my life. I was an employer. What can I say? That is how things were done. Some will say, like the hon. member for Winnipeg who has left: "It is a form of insurance." Or they will argue: "I have paid UI all my life. You have to pay me benefits even if I do not qualify." That is not true. You pay your life insurance premiums, but if you commit suicide, the insurance will not pay up. It is dreadful to hear people say things like: "I have been contributing to the UI plan for 25 years, and now I have been cut off. I have been paying fire insurance on my house for 25 years. Since there has never been a fire at my place, I never collected on the insurance. I inquired of my agent, and he told me: "Set the place on fire and we will pay up." He also warned me: "You better not get caught."

Mr. Speaker, I think the bill is sensible. The thing is to interpret it correctly and not to worry about it.

The government has a problem. It is collecting \$15 billion, but has to pay out \$22 billion. That is indeed a problem. I caution the unions looking to muddle the whole thing to be careful not to threaten our families which have nothing to do with this, our wives who have been alone for seven or eight days and our children who are truly defenceless. To these people, I say: "Watch out. Do not dare cross the threshold of my house, just in case—" One thing is sure, my family is not responsible for this bill.