

*Employment Strategy*

training program. This means, Mr. Speaker, that in a region where there is an incredible resurgence of vitality, this part of the program is extremely important. I say to the Minister of Employment and Immigration that I hope there will be something in next week's budget to help those industries, that there will be more than what the minister has done in the last six months. He says he will do something, but we have not seen anything yet. In the speech he made on November 20, he said he had introduced a bill before the House, but we see that it is just a reprint of the bill introduced by the former government. Is that what the minister calls new initiatives in this area? This government has nothing to show yet in the area of employment, and we might wonder whether the government really want to do something to improve the employment situation in areas where the need actually exists or whether they are merely trying to help the private sector.

**An hon. Member:** They are laughing at the workers. That is what they are doing!

**Mr. Bujold:** Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to another extremely important matter which has already been discussed in this House, and which has been debated from both sides this afternoon, i.e. the much talked about Canada Works program. I would like to deal tonight, Mr. Speaker, with the way selections were made by the new Minister of Employment and Immigration, and the integrity of this program which has been in existence for the past four years and through which the former government managed for three years to make a rather fair allocation of money in all these areas. We mentioned these problems to the minister many times but he has never been able to tell us exactly how this selection had been done.

Mr. Speaker, I really question the way these projects were selected. I am convinced the Minister of Employment and Immigration probably depended on his department for services rendered or maybe on the member who had the floor before me and who spoke so highly of the Canada Works projects. That might be the reason why he had so much to say about these projects, because this year he and his colleague, the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), really had a lot to do in that field.

**An hon. Member:** Porkbarrelling!

**Mr. Bujold:** Several of my colleagues in the House have already pointed out to the Minister of Employment and Immigration the problems that have been raised on that subject. I questioned him in the House and in committee but I could never get a precise answer.

**An hon. Member:** You will never get one, either.

**Mr. Bujold:** Probably because the minister is involved in a situation where he finds it difficult to select projects. In order to demonstrate how he could oppose the recommendations

[Mr. Bujold.]

made by the officials responsible for housing and employment in several regions, I would like to refer to what happened in my riding of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine and give you some facts which I think—if I am to believe the information I have been given by some of my colleagues—are very interesting. A policy has been established for Quebec and probably for other provinces where Canada Works projects have been implemented.

**An hon. Member:** Shame!

**Mr. Bujold:** Mr. Speaker, employment and immigration officials have established a practice in that riding which I am told was used frequently in other regions in Quebec and in the maritimes.

They looked into the first three phases of Canada Works to know how the money had been distributed and spent. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would quite simply like to say how the money was distributed in the riding of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. We see, for example, that in phase one our area got \$300,000 for Causapscal, \$450,000 in New Richmond, \$200,000 in Chandler and \$450,000 in the Îles-de-la-Madeleine.

That goes on in the second phase where one had up to \$3 million to arrive at the fourth phase where they set about the same proportion in those four areas of the riding based on the data put together during the three first phases and looking at how people had worked and the success of the projects. Once again this year they divided hypothetically the amount of \$3 million that had been allocated. They came to the conclusion that in one part of the riding there should be \$330,000, in another one \$474,000, and in another one, \$1,400,000 and finally, in the Îles-de-la-Madeleine, \$700,000, for a total of \$3 million.

They also decided to establish a per capita ratio. They established across the riding a per capita ratio of \$52.43 which meant they were giving a normal proportion for all people in the riding of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. The minister told me in the House, and I am quoting the official report of the debates, at page 1495, that he was relying on past performance. Past performance was the basis which government officials adopted in establishing the data to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister why he had made those selections, and when the decision was made this year in the riding of Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine. We realized based on the figures I quoted earlier, the minister had awarded \$640,000 in the area of Causapscal, \$1,300,000 in the area of Richmond, \$175,000 in the area of Chandler and \$814,000 in the Îles-de-la-Madeleine. What is worse, Mr. Speaker, the minister had on his own initiative awarded \$100,000 more to one single municipality in the riding, that of Havre Aubert, in the Îles-de-la-Madeleine. Therefore he changed all the figures established by his civil servants, who are extremely qualified people who had experience in the area and had made studies of