

Government Orders

wraps this year for strictly political reasons. I tell you—this is unacceptable.

In essence, the approach, the thinking, by the Minister of Human Resources Development is more or less as follows. I would not be stating it too directly by putting it this way: social programs and unemployment insurance have to be cut in order to stimulate job creation and growth. Imagine, Madam Speaker, hitting the unemployed and the poorest people in our society in an effort to stimulate growth and boost job creation. What great thinking. It sounds like Liberal thinking to me. It sounds like Liberal ideals.

I tell you, as is often said: this Liberal government is the most Conservative government Canada has ever had. Its thinking runs totally counter to Liberal thinking.

• (1105)

And I repeat, it is too important not to, that we have noticed over our 16 months here that the government believes it should cut social programs and unemployment insurance in order to create jobs and stimulate the economy. Even the ultraconservatives of the last century were less direct, less tough than that.

An hon. member: Less hypocritical.

Mr. Loubier: You are right, dear colleague, most importantly, they were less hypocritical. But why should we be surprised? Earlier, we talked about the failings of the old Liberal gang coming out again in the national standards issue and the push to bring Quebec into line. And other old flaws are surfacing too. Relatively new old flaws, however, because they only go back a few months. They only seem old because we were so shocked by what they said that it seems that they have always been saying it.

Why should we be shocked by the ultraconservative philosophy of creating jobs and kick starting the economy at the expense of the unemployed and the most needy, when a few months ago the Prime Minister himself said to a group of influential Toronto business people, a bastion of federalism and of extreme right-wingers, maybe even friends of the Reform movement, that the unemployed all sat around and drank beer? The leader of the country and of the government, the Prime Minister himself, said that the unemployed sit around and drink beer.

In light of this, what is so surprising about creating jobs and kick starting the economy at the expense of the unemployed when the philosophy of the country's number one man, the head of the government, is not to help the unemployed, not to create jobs, but to call them all beer drinkers?

How do you expect the government to take a different approach in Bill C-76, which by the way, basically says the same thing as the Prime Minister except in more diplomatic and

eloquent language, when the Prime Minister's opinion is that the unemployed, the people displaced by the structural changes in the workforce, all just sit around and drink beer?

Why should it come as a surprise that the Minister of Transport was cynical and arrogant during the latest dispute, when he once again used bully tactics, harshness instead of the civilized options proposed by the official opposition? Once again, in front of a large audience, he said things that were so revolting that union representatives walked out on him. He said how do you expect railway workers with only a grade nine education to understand what is going on? Just imagine the arrogance and cynicism it takes to say such a thing, that railway workers cannot possibly understand what is going on because they only have a grade nine education, and for the Prime Minister to say that the unemployed like to sit around and drink beer.

In your opinion, what kind of bill, what kind of vision of social and economic development for Canada can come from people with that kind of attitude? Such things as cutting the unemployment insurance fund, cutting everywhere. That is the Prime Minister's vision, which the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour both share.

This is not surprising, here I digress from the bill, but it is not surprising because last year, the Minister of Finance took \$600 million from the unemployment insurance fund without batting an eye, this year, he will take \$2.4 billion and next year, \$4 billion. That is their full employment policy, the full employment of all means available to them to take from the unemployed all means at their disposal to replace a lost job with one of equal quality and to participate in the growth of the economy which has been stunted since the 1990 recession.

Overall, the federal government will cut transfer payments to the Government of Quebec by 32 per cent between 1994-95 and 1997-98. That is a lot. A \$2 billion shortfall to be made up has been mentioned, but 32 per cent is enormous.

• (1110)

I repeat, this is no gift. The federal government is not giving us a gift. It is not a gift from any other source either. It is money from Quebec and Canadian taxpayers. The government is telling us that it is making cuts, but keeping certain other transfers. It cuts 32 per cent of our own money, which it redistributes in the areas of health care, post-secondary education and social assistance and we have absolutely no say in the matter.

No one at the prebudget discussions, and I attended all of them along with my hon. colleague for Témiscamingue, some of my colleagues went several times, no one told the Minister of Finance to do what he did. No one ever told the Minister of Finance he should avoid his responsibilities and offload his