

The Address—Mr. Malépart

certainly do no harm, and might even prove inspirational to some Canadians to see their members of Parliament humbling themselves before God on a daily basis, asking Him for His divine guidance.

• (1620)

Especially in these times, Mr. Speaker, when Canada stands at the political, economic, and spiritual crossroads, the challenges facing this Parliament are very important and can be exciting and rewarding too, not in the monetary or status-seeking way, but in the knowledge that we in this House of Commons are doing our part to build Canada so that some day it might truly be said of this land that "... His dominion shall be from sea even to sea ..."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the challenge set out by our Fathers of Confederation was to build a nation in keeping with basic Christian principles. What began with them as a step of faith more than a century ago has proven to be a continuing test of faith ever since. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is both a challenge and a sacred obligation for the hon. members of this House to work together in the healing of our land at this time of unparalleled opportunity.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, my first words will be to congratulate you on your re-election as Speaker of the House and to congratulate all hon. members on their election to the House. I also want to thank all the voters in the riding of Sainte-Marie who put their confidence in me. What confidence! All other candidates lost their deposit!

Mr. Speaker, having read the Speech from the Throne, I have to admit that I found it very deceiving. I expected that this Progressive Conservative government, after spending 16 years in opposition claiming that it had the solutions to all our problems, would present after five months in office something other than words and pious wishes. I admit that I am deeply worried about the two million senior citizens who built this country, about the 700,000 unemployed and those who will join their ranks, and about the seven million Canadians whose income is below \$10,000 because the government offers them little if anything at all.

The formation of the inner cabinet was one of the first moves made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Clark). This category of Canadians about whom I am worried and who represent a high percentage of the population of Canada gets no consideration from this government. Indeed, the Prime Minister did not consider it appropriate to include in the inner cabinet the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Crombie), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Alexander), and the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Atkey). Those three ministers should represent and defend the interests of the groups of Canadians they serve. It would be essential that those same ministers be present at the meetings where the main decisions are taken. I do not know why the Prime

[Mr. Richardson.]

Minister did that, whether it is because those three ministers are not competent enough or because he is simply not interested in those groups of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if those ministers had indeed taken part in the meetings of the inner cabinet and spoken for the interests of citizens that their departments serve, the Prime Minister would certainly not contemplate increasing so quickly the price of oil. I may indicate that the first victims of that increase will be the lower income group and not the industry that can pass on this hike to those same people. Moreover, those ministers would certainly not have let the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Stevens) cut 60,000 jobs in the public service thereby increasing the number of unemployed. I would like to know on which studies the government based itself to reduce the number of civil servants by 60,000. Can the President of the Treasury Board tell or assure the House that services offered to the public will not suffer from these cutbacks? How are we to know that there are not only 10,000 public servants too many? I trust that the decision to cut 60,000 public service jobs was not taken the day the Prime Minister decided to move the Canadian embassy to Jerusalem, because that was not his best day.

As stated in the throne speech, the government hopes to solve unemployment and create jobs by relying on the private sector. It should know that the private sector has long since had the opportunity to create jobs aided by government grants, with the result that there are now 700,000 unemployed. We have a lot to look forward to! I believe the government is wrong in relying only on multinationals and small and medium business, because we all know that their prime motive is profit and not job creation. One has only to consider the action taken by such companies as ITT, Cadbury, Sun Life and many others which could not care less about the workers. Often, Mr. Speaker, when governments give grants to corporations in order for them to modernize their equipment, there does not result in any new jobs. I will give you as an example a bakery with equipment producing 100 loaves of bread a minute; after receiving a grant from the federal government, they bought new equipment capable of producing 400 loaves a minute. The result is that you have only one operator instead of four, and three unemployed.

Furthermore, the Minister of Employment and Immigration decided to cut the Canada Works programs. That is unfortunate because it was one of the rare programs where the government put faith in the ordinary citizen. I hope that decision will be reviewed because in addition to creating jobs that program provided services meeting the needs of the people, particularly senior citizens. The government should also review the policy to help businesses so it will really help create employment.

Mr. Speaker, I want also draw the attention of this House to the tax credits for home owners announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie). That is an unfair decision because