These are binding definitions provided by the court. There are 50-odd different ones covering a tremendous variety of topics, which I would be glad to delineate for the record. Members may as well avail themselves of a copy because it is very interesting. The important thing is that we recognize what is here. If the system does not work, then we challenge it.

If people leave their jobs for a legitimate reason, then they should be supported. If they do not get satisfaction from their CEIC office, I would hope, if nothing else, they would go to see their member of Parliament and complain. Part of the function of a member of Parliament is to see that individuals get fair treatment from the system. That is what we are here about, however let us not throw the baby out with the bathwater.

I want to tell members that I have many constituents on the south coast of Nova Scotia who think that people who decide that they want to quit their jobs to go home and do something else, or as the minister suggested, go somewhere else, it is not on. It is not what the system is for. The system is to protect people who lose their jobs who do not want to lose their jobs. It is the voluntary quitter that is key. Just cause is a different ballgame altogether, and let us not forget it.

Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very short comment and pose a few questions.

When 19,000 of 191,000 UI applicants who were initially held to have quit their jobs without just cause subsequently were found to have just cause, could we accept a 10 per cent error in the magnitude of error in judgment? Could we? Is it fair?

Second, I ask the hon. member if it is fair that years of prior contribution by the employee will go down the drain under the clause without just cause. Is it fair? Is it fair that the burden of proof will be on the workers who cannot avail themselves of representatives and perhaps lawyers to argue their cases before a quasi-judicial tribunal. Is it fair?

Is it fair that the balance of power will be tilted to favour the employers and to the detriment of the employees? I ask: Does this member know how much it would cost to administer this particular change in the UI act?

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how much time I have to respond but I will certainly do my best.

With respect to the first point, and I am not sure exactly what he is talking about, but if the appeal process turned around 19,000 of them, then one must conclude that maybe the appeal process works. Maybe some others might conclude something else.

• (1810)

As for the business of prior contribution, every year I pay a considerable amount of money buying myself auto insurance. My wife thinks that with the way I drive it is a darn good investment.

I hope to never collect a nickel of it. I hope I never have to collect my life insurance either. The bottom line is that we pay into insurance schemes with the hope that we will never collect a claim from them. The system must be a fair one. My hon. friend from Winnipeg North may find that his constituents totally disagree and they think that anyone who wants to quit his or her job should be able to draw unemployment insurance to the end. That is fine if that is what his constituents think. It is not what mine think.

My constituents think that people who quit their jobs voluntarily should not be eligible for unemployment insurance. That is what my constituents think. As for the question of prior contributions, it is similar to any other insurance premiums. I pay and I think most people pay hoping not to collect.

I want to comment on his allegation that the balance of power is with the employer. That is a tough concept to deal with. How do I know that is true? How do I know that is not true? I do not. My hon. friends would have it so that people would walk into the office and say: "My boss sexually harassed me and he or she is guilty". There would be implied guilt to the employer with no opportunity to respond. It would be automatic. If someone walks in and says it is sexual harassment or any of the litany of other reasons it is supposed to be taken on faith. Nobody would ever scam the unemployment insurance system, would they? Everybody who goes in tells the absolute unequivocal truth. Why should there be a process to hear the other side of the story?