

Another comment with respect to the question of differing ideologies is from something which appeared on page 20 of the briefing notes we were given the other day. It comes back to the question he asked. I question the political motivation behind the part of the proposal dealing with employment benefits and services.

The federal government is now committing to work in concert with each province. The alarm bells start to sound when we start thinking about each province. The hon. member talked about inclusion and the same kinds of support across the country. Yet in my mind it will obviously be different because each province is invited to enter into agreements.

For the decentralization the hon. member has described, it tells me there will probably be a different set of circumstances for each province given its particular debt, deficit and unemployment situation. This will include the agreements. That is why I say there could be quite a difference when we are talking about federal-provincial alignment.

The design of the employment benefits and measures, how they will be implemented and a framework for evaluating the results tell me there will be consistency across the country. It just opens a social safety net to all kinds of expectations that perhaps the government has not thought about.

With respect to the member's comment about growth and small business in the country, there is no question that small business generates lots of jobs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I ask the member to summarize in the next minute or two, if she could, so that we could resume the debate.

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I have one more point with respect to building up the reserve. I will move away from the small business comments I wanted to make.

Regarding the surplus in UI, I maintain the finance minister will probably do some very creative accounting with that surplus. He will reach his 3 per cent of GDP in the next budget and it will be on the backs of taxpayers in a UI surplus. Our growth rate right now, as was just reported, has moved from 4.2 per cent to 2.3 per cent. No one can tell me our economy is going anywhere. We have not created a single sustainable job since the government came to power.

• (1205)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before we resume debate I will return to the matter raised by the hon. member for Calgary Southeast in her intervention about another member on the government side referring to a member of the official opposition, the Bloc Québécois, not being present in her seat. I told the hon. member at that time that I would review the blues.

### *Supply*

I have the blues before me and a reference was made by a government member that first of all she leaves. The member for Calgary Southeast was entirely right that it occurred. Second and most important it goes against the convention of the House to make any reference to the absence of any member at any one time from the Chamber.

I know other members such as the member for Lévis, and I believe someone on the government side, wished to rise on the point. I will consider the matter closed now that it has been raised correctly by the member for Calgary Southeast. I thank her for her intervention and the matter is closed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the motion put forward by the hon. member for Mercier.

Before going any further, I would like to thank the member for Calgary Southeast for her vigilance, her attention and especially for having raised the matter. I appreciate the intention, because the member for Mercier does make a great contribution, she is indeed very active in the House. I think the remarks in question were inappropriate.

The debate is on a motion which reads as follows:

That this House condemn the government for choosing to reform unemployment insurance in a way that maintains overlap and duplication in the manpower sector and thus prevents the Government of Quebec from adopting a true manpower development policy of its own.

I listened to the arguments by the member for Calgary Southeast on the amendment she is proposing. I shall reserve my comments on it for the moment, but I would like to thank her for paying attention. Her remarks indicate that other provinces would also like to take charge of manpower training within their borders.

However, after touring the country with the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development last year, I felt that some provinces, such as the Atlantic provinces, were not as keen, perhaps not fuelled by the same desire. They wanted the federal government to remain very visible in this area, because they felt that their province may be experiencing economic difficulties in this regard.

I simply want to say that the amendment proposed by the member for Calgary Southeast would not be easy to implement because there does not appear to be a consensus, unlike in Quebec. This has been shown very clearly. I will tell the member for Calgary Southeast this: I will discuss it in my speech, I will recall the historical background of this claim by Quebec and the reason it is so important to us.

To us, manpower training means education. Under Canada's Constitution, education is a provincial matter. This is particularly important to Quebec, because education is also a cultural