

Oral Questions

concerned, the Liberal Party of Canada and the New Democratic Party of Canada, are the very people who opposed strenuously for over a year the implementation of measures that would protect the unemployed people that they claim they seek to protect.

We increased the funds under UI from \$350 million two or three years ago to \$2.21 billion to help unemployed Canadians. In our quest to help unemployed people adjust we were opposed all the way by the now pretenders to power on the other side.

Mr. Cid Samson (Timmins—Chapleau): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

The draft document dated December 1992 written by the minister's director of benefit entitlements was sent to all regional managers and directors of insurance services and benefits programs, the executive director and directors general of insurance, the director general of benefit pay systems, the directors of insurance policy and the legal counsel of insurance.

Earlier this week the minister repudiated this document, a document which demands that workers remain in unsafe working conditions, as well as a host of other intolerable situations. This was done under the name of reasonable alternative.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member may wish to put a question.

Mr. Samson: Madam Speaker, if the guidelines in this document are not to be followed, will the minister table documents in this House which clearly state this, as well as documents which outline the sensitive procedures the minister has stated repeatedly will be followed when adjudicating claims under Bill C-105?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, the printer of new money, should know. He should really reflect on this. Demagoguery will lead you nowhere. It will lead no one anywhere.

I have never seen the documents that he so proudly distributed to everyone on the Hill and to every media

reporter in the country. This is work from some level in the department.

The important issue here is for Canadians to know that in the implementation of this provision under Bill C-105 its only purpose is to try to rule that benefits will not be given to those who choose without provocation, without reason whatsoever, to seek benefits.

These are the only people targeted and whatever he says will not change the issue.

Mr. Cid Samson (Timmins—Chapleau): Madam Speaker, with regard to the last statement the minister made concerning what I said about not changing anything, it does not matter what anybody says, nothing is going to change. At least I do not print documents that are as destructive as this one is.

On April 7, 1978 the Tories published the report of its task force on unemployment. Page 9 of the report states:

Most people on unemployment insurance would rather be working. A problem exists, however, in that there is still a myth held by Canadians that UI causes unemployment and that people on UI are lazy.

On March 28, 1992 the minister said in *The Toronto Star* that unemployed workers "want to work. They are not lazy. The least you can ask of political leaders is that they identify solutions and try to put them in place".

• (1130)

Why are the minister and his government going back on their word and deliberating creating a perception that all recipients of UI are shiftless and lazy, a perception which pits Canadians against Canadians?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Those are very long preambles and long questions.

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, how can these individuals stand in the House and pretend that they care about the unemployed when they opposed strenuously the efforts of this government to try to help those people who through no fault of their own became unemployed.

We have made expenditures to train those people, which is the key to reintegration into the labour market, at from \$350 million to \$2.21 billion. The adjustment