

**Mr. Saint-Julien:** Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the hon. member for years. I am pleased to meet him tonight.

Further to his question, I would like to say that the motion now being debated fails to mention that the government's policy was not to pay unemployment insurance benefits any more to workers who quit their jobs or are dismissed. I remember that we voted on Bill C-21 a few years ago. Even some members of the Bloc Québécois voted in favour of just cause, on Division No. 104. They forgot to mention just cause in their motion tabled several days or weeks later in Parliament.

The hon. member has a great deal of experience. Five reasons qualify as just cause, but they forgot to talk about those reasons. They tell the people, "If you leave your job, you won't get unemployment insurance."

I am not tied to a Liberal motion. I am not a partisan of the other party; I am a member of this party. I did say that I would be vigilant on second reading, in the legislative committee and on third reading for the people of Abitibi and not for the people in the Liberal Party of Canada.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. He had a 10-minute speech and five minutes for questions or comments.

The hon. member for Papineau on a question of privilege.

[Translation]

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member started his comments by saying he had not seen me in a very long time. You know very well that in this House nobody is supposed to impute motives to members who may have responsibilities which take them outside the House of Commons.

I remind the hon. member that for months, with his colleague behind him, the hon. member for Outremont, I sat at the Bélanger-Campeau commission, and then at two parliamentary committees set up by his own Prime Minister to try to solve the constitutional issue, the Beaudoin-Edwards committee and then the Beaudoin-Dobbie committee.

I say to the hon. member—

### *Supply*

**An hon. member:** Baloney.

**Mr. Ouellet:** —that his comment was quite improper. It denotes an ignoramus of the worst kind.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I believe that is sufficient. The hon. member for Abitibi.

[Translation]

**Mr. Saint-Julien:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I respect the hon. member. I am pleased to see him here. I apologize. I can see he is quite upset, he is furious. I absolve myself.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments and points of privilege are now terminated.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East):** Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Nickel Belt.

I welcome the opportunity to enter into the debate. We support the opposition motion. It is unfortunate that we must talk about unemployment insurance when we should be talking about employment programs. However we must do so because of the severe attack unemployment insurance has taken. It is especially directed against women and people who have left their jobs for various reasons. That type of attack is one that none of us from this side of the House can support. It is deplorable that the government should even consider it at this time.

Canada faces a severe unemployment crisis and I am shocked that this government has decided that the unemployed must suffer even more. The change to UI is a blatant attempt to blame workers who are scrambling for jobs in this difficult time of economic restructuring. Clearly the government should have instead focused its