

*Government Orders*

despair than hope for these people, and this is something which can also trigger instability.

This morning we were told that the UN is starting to make a parallel between the resurgence of trouble in the world and the rise of poverty. Those who enjoy job security for five years or who, in some cases, are sheltered from financial setbacks forever cannot imagine, from the comfort of their homes, that there are people who depend solely on UI benefits or welfare, whose lives are in the hands of a civil servant who will decide if they are entitled to UI benefits and for how long, people who keep submitting their resumes and hoping for training programs that are not available.

The truth is not what we are hearing here today, that Parliament should ensure that all Canadians have access to training. The truth is that there are a great many people waiting to take part in training programs which are not accessible to them. That is the truth. We are in the middle of a psychodrama here with, on one side, all of the lazy people who do not want training and, on the other side, the Liberal government acting like a saviour and saying: "First, we will reduce you to poverty and then we will urge you to get some training and go back to work".

To think like that, you cannot be living in the real world. You must, however, have a vision of what development and hope should be. As far as I am concerned, this bill deals a severe blow to the Atlantic provinces. The vast majority of the people in Atlantic Canada voted for the Liberals. And with no warning whatsoever, from what we can tell, they will now end up with an economy in worse shape than ever, because the infrastructure programs also included in the budget will not begin to offset the economic impact of cuts to the unemployment insurance program.

The Atlantic provinces stand to lose \$630 million. This shortfall of \$630 million will not be offset by the Groundfish Adjustment Program. This is a very sad day indeed, because it seems to me that ideology is taking precedence over the real needs of ordinary people. The government is proceeding with cuts without having a real employment policy.

• (1110)

An hon. member opposite said the Bloc Quebecois never made a single constructive proposal. Well, from the very beginning, in committee and in the House, we mentioned the need for a genuine job creation policy. In Quebec, we call that a full employment policy, a pro-active employment policy.

In the committee on which I sit, I had to make a big fuss before they would invite someone who is an expert, not on mini-measures, mini-reforms and mini-programs but on the kind of pro-active employment policy that involves a large number of components and instruments and whose chief characteristic is the basic and abiding concern of the government for job creation; not employment created at the cost of productivity but an

employment policy that would require taking a closer look at all the measures taken by the government, in the light of the need to deal with unemployment.

Last night I read a very interesting document by one of the advisors on the task force of the Minister of Human Resources Development. It started by stating that, in Canada, governments have not been concerned about employment. Incidentally, the same advisor was deputy minister at Employment and Immigration Canada for a number of years. I think that is an interesting point. And I think he underestimates an aspect that we in Quebec have developed, perhaps because we were hit harder by the first recession, and I am referring to the need for consultation between companies, workers represented by their labour organizations, regional interest groups and governments. Consultation has to be learned, and let me tell you, from what I have seen of the government opposite, it has yet to realize that consultation is necessary.

I wish, and I consider this another constructive proposal, that the government in its search for a job creation policy would realize that consultation is essential. What does Bill C-17 do? It starts by destroying the trust that is a necessary part of the consultation process. The government starts by saying: Cut unemployment insurance, and cut in the Maritimes and Quebec, before our social reform and before we consult people, and freeze public service compensation before starting a genuine discussion but do not touch corporations, the tax treatment of the rich, tax shelters or trusts. And then they say: Let us consult!

There are words to describe this, but they would be unparliamentary.

Oh, and another thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I am very disappointed that we did not have an opportunity to discuss the amendments one by one in the House. And I also want to mention a point that is very important, and I am referring to the negative impact on the economy. I will be brief, since my colleagues will get back to this later on.

I wanted to say that the money that will not go to the provinces is money that was used to pay for basic necessities, including the rent. This means small landlords will be affected because it will be harder to collect the rent. The money was used to pay for food and for all those basic necessities that are often produced locally and are in fact part of the economy of each community, of my riding, of your riding and of the regions. It is money that will not go into the economy. It affects the most vulnerable members of our society. It affects those who already have no security in their lives. It affects those who often make seemingly irrational decisions. It affects people on welfare who, once a month, receive a cheque many members here would spend in less than a week-end, and people who depend on their unemployment insurance cheque, but do not know how long they will keep on getting it.