

*Supply*

**Mr. Williams:** Without any disciplinary action whatsoever.

Today, a longstanding member of the Liberal Party, a former member of the cabinet, has been turfed out of the chairmanship of the justice committee because yesterday he voted against the government. We have seen they will not tolerate it on that side of the House which is a disgrace.

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what the hon. member for the Reform Party had to say about a particular issue. Why is it impossible to change things? I think the human resources investment fund is a good example.

I think the federal government, probably because of the power of the bureaucrats and also the impression that Ottawa can solve all Canada's problems for Canadians across the country and that it knows all the answers, this attitude, in the case of the human resources investment fund, means that the federal government will go on spending vast amounts of money but in addition, as in this particular case, it will be other people's money, because the money in the Unemployment Insurance Fund is provided by employers and employees. There is no government money in that fund. The federal government uses the fund to intervene in areas under provincial jurisdiction, especially education and manpower training. So when a member of this House wonders why change is impossible, one reason is that the federal government refuses to respect these jurisdictions and thus control its spending.

Now I realize that the Reform Party says we are separatists and do not want to go on being part of Canada, but even from a federalist perspective, would the hon. member not agree that in the case of the human resources investment fund, the government is committing fraud? Because if the money paid into the fund by employers and employees were not used in the human resources investment fund, do you know what we could do? We could gradually reduce employee and employer premiums so that the money, instead of getting lost in bureaucratic channels would go directly into the economy to create the jobs this society so badly needs and the present government has failed to create. What does the member for the Reform Party think of this approach?

[*English*]

**Mr. Williams:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's question, of course the federal government can spend money as it sees fit.

As a member of the opposition side, when I look at my colleagues from the Bloc Quebecois on my right, yes they are separatists. As far as I am aware, they always will be as long as

they call themselves the Bloc Quebecois and are committed to the breakup of the country.

The point Bloc members have been trying to make is that they want control over the money. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever for anybody to think that the panacea of the breakup of the country is going to create jobs. It will do the exact opposite.

Separation of the country will cause unemployment to rise. If Bloc members were interested in helping the people who elected them to this place, they would be working to create employment, to reduce uncertainty, to create an economic climate where people could get work.

When I talk to people in the province of Quebec they seem to be the same as the people I talk to in the province of Alberta. They are concerned about mortgages, houses, careers, their kids and their future. Nobody I talked to was concerned about separation, other than the detrimental effects it will have on their futures. There may be a future of high taxation and low opportunity created through the concept the Bloc is trying to achieve.

Now we see that Bloc members have become totally unprincipled in the fact that they have watered down their separation message by saying: "Please vote for us. We want to separate if we can get some kind of economic association with Canada". I suggest that they put their shoulders to the wheel and join with all Canadians in recognizing that we have a responsibility to all Canadians from coast to coast to provide them with a future, secure housing, education and to provide them with the things they want. I can assure the member, separation is not one of them.

• (1640)

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the matter of full supply of the estimates for fiscal year 1995-96. This year the main estimates total \$164.2 billion of which the government is seeking parliamentary approval for \$48 billion and new spending authority. The balance of \$116.2 billion represents statutory payments which have already received parliamentary approval.

The main estimates incorporate \$2.3 billion worth of the \$3.4 billion of 1995-96 expenditure reduction measures achieved through the government's program review. The comprehensive review was undertaken last fall to identify the federal government's core roles and responsibilities and to reallocate resources to priority areas in order to provide effective affordable government.

[*Translation*]

This program review was much more extensive than any previous across-the-board expenditure reduction initiative; every department was reviewed. As a result, all sorts of spending