

Supply

My concerns and reservations about this bill are still here. This evening we will simply be voting on a motion specifically designed to overthrow the government.

I am not interested in overthrowing this government. I am interested in improving a bill. Therefore, I will vote against it with pleasure. I am perfectly comfortable with that. I mentioned it to the media, at home, this morning and again at lunch time, and the reaction was: "Well, Mr. Bernier, you are absolutely right. Let us give them a chance to improve their bill." Would the hon. member for Hamilton East not say so?

I will never vote for the Leader of the Opposition and his party. I know his track record too well for that.

Ms. Copps: Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of those people who say: "Sure, I have strong principles, but if these do not suit you, I have others." What the hon. member said today runs directly counter to what he said on January 15, 1993, when he told—

An hon. member: Listen to this.

Ms. Copps: —the press: "Elected members of Parliament must strive to tackle the underlying causes of unemployment instead of attacking the unemployed." We must attack the cause, not the victim. Today he has an opportunity—

Mr. Saint-Julien: Not Liberals and bitches.

Ms. Copps: —to stop attacking the unemployed, but he will not take it. Why? Because he is a yes-man and a whiner and will not stand up for his principles. If I am wrong, he should at least support this motion which sends a clear message and repeats what was said by his own colleague, the hon. member for Jonquière, who now claims they do not make sense.

Those words were taken directly from a statement by the hon. member for Jonquière. If he has any trouble with reading or pronunciation, he should talk to his friend, the hon. member for Jonquière, who made all the statements reproduced today in the motion. It says clearly and distinctly that we are against this bill because this policy is "too severe" and "too tough", "puts people in a desperate situation", "goes beyond fairness", is "extremist" and "right wing" and is therefore unacceptable to the Canadian people.

[English]

If the member finds fault with the wording of the resolution he should find fault with his colleague, the

member for Jonquière, who actually spoke these very words only two weeks ago.

[Translation]

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Abitibi use a term that was entirely uncalled for. He said: "Not Liberals and bitches", while looking at the hon. member who had the floor. I think such language is unacceptable, and the hon. member should withdraw.

Mr. Saint-Julien: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You can check the blues. I have nothing to withdraw. When I referred to "chiennes", we can talk about a "chienne de travail", which is something you wear at work. A "chienne de travail" is a smock. The hon. member, however, is never in the House, so he does not know the meaning of the word "work".

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, that is pretty far-fetched. What connection is there between a smock and this debate?

As far as my attendance is concerned, I have been here every time the House was sitting. I think my attendance compares favourably with his. In any case, the kind of language he used in referring to a great lady like the hon. member who was addressing the House is entirely unacceptable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): In any case, if these terms were used, they were part of an aside, and I did not hear them from my chair. We will check as soon as we have the blues.

Mr. Jean-Marc Robitaille (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, as far as inappropriate language is concerned, I must say I deplore the terms used by the hon. member for Hamilton East, and I wanted to repeat what I said before. I know that in the past the hon. member for Hamilton East did not appreciate certain things that were said on this side of the House. I would have thought that subsequently she would have set a good example.

The hon. member for Hamilton East says we are doing nothing to fight unemployment. Is the hon. member aware that in 1983, her Liberal government spent \$225 million on manpower training? Ten years later, this government is spending more than \$3.5 billion on training. These are specific measures to fight unemployment which benefit the unemployed, so we are not just giving them an unemployment insurance cheque. The Liberals would rather keep people on unemployment insurance, give them cheques and keep them poor, because people are easier to exploit that way.