

*Supply*

[English]

**Mr. Williams:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. member is engaging in debate and this is actually the time for questions and comments. We are not all going to get a chance to question the President of the Treasury Board. Therefore, I ask that she limit her remarks to comments on his speech and a question.

• (1545)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I do not think the hon. member was in the House when I asked if there were any questions or comments. At that time nobody rose so we went to debate. The hon. member is now speaking on debate.

**Mr. Williams:** I apologize if I missed that, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Lalonde:** Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague cannot give me back my momentum.

The G-7 meeting in Halifax confirms our fear that the federal government intends to centralize further. The G-7, which includes the world's most industrialized nations, is concerned about education and job development. We understand this to be the current trend of centralized countries, and this is why we feel these votes must be controlled. The reason for our speaking out against the votes this afternoon is to say, in the only way this Parliament allows and on the budget, what we could not say during consideration of Bill C-76, which is that, as far as Quebec is concerned, at least, others may agree, the votes available should be transferred to Quebec as tax credits.

Why? For greater efficiency. The Conseil du patronat and the labour congresses are saying what they are saying, simply because Quebecers are a distinct people and Quebec is a distinct society with its own approach to its development. Its labour market is also distinct. And in the case of this measure, the only way to ensure efficient use of the rare public funds available for employment training, skills development and job development, the various job readiness programs is for them to be integrated. The key word is "integration".

The Standing Committee on Human Resources Development was concerned about integration for Canada as a whole. I think integration is what they are after and I can understand why, for the rest of Canada, it would be considered efficient to run it out of Ottawa. I respect this decision, because it is historically based. I submit, however, that differences in labour markets will mean integration will have to take these differences into account. In the case of Quebec, however, efficiency dictates the integration of all programs.

Last week's women's march evocatively known as the "bread and roses" march illustrated the need for integrated employ-

ment training policies. Why? The clientele of job development or job readiness program training are either welfare recipients or people who have never had benefits of any sort—women who have been at home and have to join the labour force, young people and people receiving UI benefits. The clientele is varied and, with the unresolved jurisdiction problem, we feel the only solution is for Quebec to have full control, even though elsewhere in Canada Ottawa has full control.

• (1550)

The only way to be effective and to ensure this integration, to provide these people with the services that they need, whether they are welfare recipients or unemployment insurance beneficiaries or whether they never received any benefit, is to have an integrated system. As things now stand, however, that is impossible. Who is paying for this? The hon. members opposite? Us? No, ordinary Canadians, the people who have some needs.

This is why we are saying that there is only one way, in this sector, to be efficient. As federalist Liberal ministers from Quebec have said, we must agree that the manpower development policy must be the responsibility of Quebec and that the necessary funds and tax points be transferred to Quebec.

We are again faced with the problem of people who are falling through the cracks in the system, as we saw with the Carrefour Jeunesse-Emploi program. There were different types of clients, and the minister claimed that he had to put an end to the subsidy. This does not make any sense. Nor does it make any sense that we were not able to put forward an amendment to correct the situation, to have a debate and a vote on this issue. It makes no sense whatsoever that we should constantly have to plead, that we should be unable to control all the government funds to better serve the public.

I must add that within this budget, money going to job stimulation and employability has been reduced. We can question the fact that the money that will help people to get back to work, if it is used as effectively as is claimed, has been reduced. We can question that.

Yet, we can question even more that the money once taken from the consolidated revenue fund is, increasingly, being replaced by money taken from the unemployment insurance account. It is unacceptable to use the unemployment insurance account as a cash cow. It is important to point out that not all workers pay unemployment insurance premiums, but only those whose maximum earnings are \$40,000. I will check the figure. Anyone who works extra hours does not pay more than the maximum contribution limit. Therefore, it is in the employer's interest to hire people to work long hours.

Therefore, middle income and upper income workers are the ones who pay unemployment insurance premiums. Companies