

Supply

of this country have passed, or do we have to piffle on another piece of legislation?

Mr. Simmons: Madam Speaker, I know the gentleman from St. John's East, as he alluded to, is a bit tender from the words of my good friend from Gander—Grand Falls. At the same time I am tempted to say that if Jimmy Bakker taught us anything, it is that you should not try to be an evangelist unless you have got something in the gut. I say to the gentleman from St. John's East that he preaches today a false doctrine. He does not believe a word he is saying. He is doing a great job of mouthing the party line on this one.

• (1730)

This is the brunt of my question to him. Can the hon. member stand there and categorically say that, knowing that his constituents are watching him, and in case a few miss this this afternoon, I will see that they know about it. Can he categorically say today that none of his constituents will be adversely affected by the new unemployment insurance legislation?

I put it to the hon. member that many of his constituents will be out of pocket many hundreds and thousands of dollars. He stands there and he characterizes it in very different terms. If you were to be carried away by his evangelical speech, you would get the feeling that Utopia arrives when this bill is passed finally by both Houses of Parliament.

We know the difference. I say to the hon. member that he is being less than candid with his constituents, if he leaves us with the impression that somehow everybody, without exception, in his own riding is going to be better off because of this bill. I put it to him that many of them are going to be worse off.

Just one further question, so I do not have to get up again. He does a marvellous job, an absolutely fantastic job of mouthing the rhetoric on the issue of training. I ask him to look at what this so-called training initiative has done to the Canadian Jobs Strategy in Newfoundland. It is robbing small communities of many tens of thousands of dollars they can no longer access, because every time they try and tailor an application to legitimate, justifiable training options within the parameters of their communities, they are told it is not good enough. The application is turned back and the net effect is that the Canadian Jobs Strategy, Canada Works, or whatever we called it over the years, that short-term job creation initiative is now having less positive impact on rural

Newfoundland because of this farce about a training option.

I put it to the hon. member that in real terms, in terms of the bill that is otherwise before the other House of Parliament now and in terms of the motion here today, this training as it is with the Canadian Jobs Strategy is a complete ruse, it is a complete farce as it applies to rural Newfoundland.

I say to the hon. member that unwittingly or otherwise, he is aiding and abetting the very shut-down of rural Canada with this rhetoric. I appeal to him as a fellow Newfoundlander to come clean on this one. Either he is duping or he is being duped on this particular issue. Training, yes, but make the training realistic to the opportunities that are available.

My first question, in case he has forgotten it: Can he honestly say to his constituents that without exception, none of them will be adversely affected in terms of dollars in the pocket as a result of Bill C-21?

Mr. Reid: Madam Speaker, the answer to the first question is, no. I obviously cannot stand here, neither have I purported to stand here, and say that none of my constituents would be negatively affected. Some of my constituents will be negatively affected, and I am sorry for that.

I will tell you this: Most of my constituents, be it through the change in the economic region or be it through some of the new opportunities and options that we are putting before them, will be better off and will have the opportunity to make their lives and the lives of their families and communities better.

Second, on the question of training, the hon. member makes a point. It is recognized that in some areas of our province, the training components may not be as available under job development of the Canadian Jobs Strategy. It is a case that I have carried to the minister and it is something that I think the department is looking at. I say no more than that.

I will say that first of all, there is Section 25, which has been a huge benefit to most of us and to the people in our constituencies. As well, to call the training a farce is in itself a farce.

I look at the people that the Basilica of St. John the Baptist brought in when they decided to restore the building they are in, a beautiful historic building more than 100 years old, and I may say a program started by my