

Supply

should be the government's objective. If the federal government does not adjust and act accordingly, it will be swept away.

[English]

Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, things are becoming more and more curious as I listen to my colleagues from the Bloc and the Reform Party.

I listened to Bloc members saying they agree with Reform. Then I listened to Reform members asking why government is not creating more jobs. That sounds a lot like the NDP. Then when we have the Reform and the NDP voting together against the government on issues like gun control, voting against the veto power, perhaps there is a reason for the hon. member's confusion.

Speaking of confusion, I would like to touch again on a point of confusion my friend from the Bloc seems to have. He seems to be suffering from the same affliction as the member for Yorkton—Melville in that he thinks the government was elected on jobs, jobs, jobs. Again, there is probably confusion there given the close relationship between the former government, which did promise that, and the Bloc Quebecois whose members tend to be a lot of recycled Tories.

I am wondering about the comment the member from the Bloc made with regard to what should have happened. This is not a world of should have but a world of what has happened. The people of Quebec rejected what was put to them by the members of the Bloc Quebecois.

The member has made a strong statement that there is not going to be any agreement. I regret that because it seems the package put forward by the Minister of Human Resources Development goes a long way in allowing the federal government and the provincial government to work together to achieve exactly what we have been hearing from the member from the Bloc all year long. I encourage him and his party to co-operate with the government rather than destroy the country.

[Translation]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, when the government member expresses bewilderment at the opposition parties holding similar views on certain things, this may be the time to twig to the fact that, when you make campaign commitments, the decent thing to do is to honour them.

When you say you are going to create jobs, you are supposed to have corresponding policies. When you defeat a government like the former Conservative government by saying that its policies were unacceptable, you have to meet the commitments you made subsequently. The idea is not to win elections, but to carry out the mandates you have been given. That is the goal and what must be achieved.

There is a lesson for the government in this. For two years the Liberal government told us that there was no problem in Quebec. It told all Canadians: "There is no problem in Quebec, and if we do our job properly, the Quebec problem will disappear". But then they found themselves with 49.4 per cent of the people of Quebec saying yes to sovereignty. The Prime Minister acts as the middle man between Canadians and Quebecers. Canadians realized that he had lost touch with reality and should perhaps be removed so people could talk directly.

I think it important that the message be understood. Our objective should be effective government. On this point a number of parties could agree. Why could we not think all Federalists should basically promote very broad decentralization if they really want this country to continue to function.

In any case, throughout the world today, the solution lies in small groups, which have the tools to develop and do so successfully, controlling the course they want to take and making their own choices.

• (1350)

[English]

Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A Liberal member misrepresented the position and the statement I was making. I made it absolutely clear that I was not expecting—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is not making a point of order, he is getting into argument. He will have an opportunity in debate to deal with what has been said.

Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand Liberal members have been splitting their time and I have been asked not to split my time. I will be using the full 20 minutes, plus the 10 minutes allotted for questions and comments.

I rise today with some reluctance to speak on this motion. I hope to have an opportunity to speak on the bill and on the many good points in the legislation. However, today we are debating the Bloc opposition motion condemning the government's employment insurance legislation for maintaining overlap and duplication in labour market training. I will try to confine my comments to that motion and to the aspects of the bill which relate to that motion. However, I would like to speak about the many good things the bill will do and I hope to have the opportunity to do so in the future.

If the hon. member and her colleagues in the Bloc had taken the time to give thorough consideration to the new employment insurance legislation they would see it does not maintain overlap and duplication in labour market training. After all, the Minister of Human Resources Development tabled the legislation only last Friday. It is a comprehensive document which deserves serious consideration by all members of the House.