

*Government Orders*

People in my riding find it totally unacceptable to spend \$28 million that way, when the entire network of CBC regional stations has been closed down, and to see that the Liberal government has never said a word to reverse that decision. This kind of attitude is a slap in the face of people who are entitled to regional services. The government is taking advantage of an omnibus bill to put one over on us quickly as far as borrowing authority is concerned, without requiring the corporation to account in any way for the use of these funds.

• (1245)

Even when I give my children an allowance, I ask them to tell me a little how they plan to use the money. In some cases the government lends money and asks for an accounting, while in this instance, it is giving the corporation a \$25 million margin to manoeuvre, without asking it for any kind of accounting. This is another example of how this government behaves: as if it had been in power for eight years and was totally incapable of coming up with any fresh ideas or solutions to problems. The fact is that this government is only beginning its mandate. In its first few months in office, it has introduced a bill which systematically reneges on the commitments made during the election campaign.

I want to come back briefly to the issue of employer premiums. On the one hand, the government creates a nice, politically correct program such as the Infrastructure Program which allows it to announce in various locations available seasonal, temporary jobs. On the other hand, it introduces a measure which is not as glamorous as the Infrastructure Program, but which would allow those who create the most jobs, namely small and medium-sized businesses, to be active and give some confidence back to people. So what does the government do? It tells businesses to wait until 1995 for the premium level to be brought back to \$3 per \$100. In other words, it is sending out a message that job creation is not such a priority after all, that the machinery of government will lumber on, that the unemployment rate will fall one day and that jobs will ultimately be created.

Basically, this is typical of a government that has decided not to honour the promise it has made during the election campaign to give priority to job creation, to put the people of Quebec and Canada back to work, especially young people. Take for example the 4,000 engineers in Quebec who are out of work. Would it not be possible to develop some aggressive job-creation programs to provide work for these people?

I would say that, as far as job creation is concerned, this government does not make the grade. It is a failure. During the summer holiday just a few weeks away, wherever we go, if we visit campgrounds or attend any number of functions, people are going to tell us: "You politicians are all the same. You make election promises you never keep". That about sums up what

this government, a government that wanted to give people hope, has accomplished.

I derive great pride from the fact that, for various reasons, the people of Quebec have decided that this government did not have what it took in terms of commitment, I mean the necessary level of credibility to honour its commitments. In that respect, we can be pretty proud of ourselves in Quebec. The people have voted for a party capable of representing them in the opposition, to make itself heard and state clearly what commitments have to be fulfilled in Quebec. There is nothing in Bill C-17 to give people hope.

When you tell people in need of a job: "The first thing we are going to do for you is to require that you work more weeks to qualify", you kill their confidence in the economy and contribute to maintaining the negative dynamics by which fear is fostered.

Bill C-17 was a golden opportunity for the government to put its cards on the table. Such a bill could have been used to address problems like tax havens and family trusts. Where in this bill are there measures affecting well-off people who could make a significant difference in terms of creating jobs? They have not been called on to help create jobs.

• (1250)

In fact, this bill is somewhat reminiscent of the budget as a whole. The Liberal government prepared a budget that was a little lazy. It could have taken advantage of the momentum created by its election to bring together all segments of Canadian society, including employers, unions and social groups, and ask them in December 1993: "What shall we do to stimulate employment?", to clearly show we must join forces on this.

Their budget consultation process was a bit of a sham because they did the opposite of what the people told them to do. They decided to throw out the old files prepared by the bureaucrats and to recycle the Campbell material into the Martin material. They continued to act like before without really stimulating employment.

I think this government relies way too much on the four-year mandate that lies ahead, telling itself: "We will hand out the usual goodies at the end of our mandate to ensure that we get re-elected". But they forget that their mandate is not to win the election but to offer good government, to ensure that Canadians have jobs that they like and that they can do something with it.

I would also like to let you know that some people asked this morning: "How can the people opposite—that is, Bloc members—criticize such a bill when what they want is to break up Canada?"

Instead of scaremongering, I can tell you that in proposing our amendments to Bill C-17, we tried to defend the interests of Quebecers. When we say that increasing the number of weeks of work required to qualify for UI goes against common sense, you