

sider whether or not it is incumbent upon a government to provide the information necessary for people to make learned and accurate judgments about its policy direction and the impact of it. Perhaps he could take that to caucus tomorrow. Perhaps he could urge upon Cabinet, if Cabinet deigns to show up,—perhaps he could not tell me even if he did since the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) is not likely to allow him to talk to me anyway—that that would be one of the first things it could consider.

The second point is: Has the Government been honest? We have to wonder about that. I remember not long before election day the Prime Minister saying that he would be able to create tens of thousands of jobs almost immediately after the Conservatives were elected to govern. I must confess that I doubted it, but I did not say it. It was said by the Prime Minister. Whether or not I doubted it, the Prime Minister apparently believed it to be true. Yet when he took office, did he create those jobs? No. What did he do? He set about to eliminate jobs, saying all the time that if things worked out somewhere down the road a piece, maybe things would improve and therefore maybe things would be better.

Mr. St. Germain: They have.

Mr. Deans: I hear the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody. If he were to be entirely up to date he would understand that the numbers of jobs available in the country today are fewer than the numbers of jobs available in the country on September 4. Therefore, that indicates to me that the action of the Government in total over that short period of time, if it created any jobs at all—and it has not directly, at least—or if it has had any impact at all, it has been a negative impact. Notwithstanding, the Prime Minister did not say on those days just prior to the election, when he was going around telling everyone everywhere that somehow he would be able to perform minor miracles, if not major miracles, and that individually they would find work somehow somewhere, that one of his first priorities would be to go to Ottawa and eliminate jobs. I am sure Mr. Speaker will remember that when the Prime Minister was confronted with the suggestion that he was likely to eliminate a significant number of jobs in the Public Service he denied it. I think the evidence is now in. Quite clearly his denial was based upon a false premise. In fact, the Government had a hidden agenda. Notwithstanding public pronouncements about its intentions on behalf of the unemployed, it in fact intended to cut out a certain number of jobs in the Public Service and in so doing affect detrimentally the number of support jobs in the private sector. Therefore, when we apply the test of honesty, we have to say that it comes up somewhat short.

Then we get to the question of sacred trusts. They are not like trusts at trust companies. These are sacred trusts, the kind one never breaks. They are just a part of one's soul; nothing would make one change a sacred trust. That does not seem to be the interpretation of members of the Conservative Party. Sacredness to them is an erstwhile thing; if something is sacred today, it may be sacred tomorrow but then again it may not.

The Address — Mr. Deans

“After all, these things are open to interpretation”, says the Prime Minister. He did say it, but then again he did not, he says. What he really meant was something else, he thinks, and then he smiles. I always thought that a sacred trust was something not to be violated.

When they said that social programs were sacred, I thought that meant that they were there to stay. Apparently for this Government it means something quite different. Taking that into account, along with its actions on the job front, maybe in the test of honesty it dropped a little short over the first two and a half to three months.

Then we have to go to the test of government understanding. Did they show the kind of compassion and understanding about which the Prime Minister so often talked, that civility which the Prime Minister told us was absolutely necessary in the dealings between government and the public?

Mr. King: It is.

Mr. Deans: I want to say again that I do wonder. They have struck fear in the hearts of many people in this land with their inability to recognize the problems which would befall those whose unemployment insurance benefits have been changed as a result of the economic statement of the Government. They have clearly indicated to those facing retirement in the not too distant future that the system will be changed in some way so that whatever planning they have done or whatever they may have anticipated may or not be there. They certainly have not come forward with jobs.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall quite clearly the questions I asked of the last government about people between the ages of 55 and 65 who were unemployed through no fault of their own and no longer qualified for unemployment insurance or welfare benefits. They found themselves at that very delicate period in their lives when they were building up equity for their retirement, faced with the real possibility, if not the probability, that they might never work again or, if they did, chances were that it would be at low-paying jobs. Thus they would not be able to contribute in the same amounts to their pension programs, and they would probably lose their pension programs because there was no portability. I remember the now Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald) with tears as big as crocodile tears running down her face. She almost had to use the hem of her dress to dry herself. It was terrible; how she bled openly for those people. However, when I asked her the other day about the exact same thing; where were the jobs, where was the concern where was the Government's automatic understanding, and where was the compassion and the civility, she sat there supporting this. There will come a day, I tell you, when you will desert them. They will let you down just as they have let down so many others, the people about whom I am speaking. The Minister of Employment and Immigration knows what those people are going through. Does she come forward with a special program? Does she extend the UIC benefits? Does she have some kind of a special development program so that they can get back into the workforce, a special training program aimed