

*Supply*

have more of this jurisdiction and we lose sight of the big picture.

It is totally unacceptable that we continue to debate these five points and we forget why the people in Canada in the last election tried to put in place a government they thought would create jobs.

• (1340)

For two years it has been going on and on and has not done a thing. Why is the Bloc not asking the government about some kind of job creation strategy. How many jobs are being created by this? How many jobs are being destroyed by the unemployment insurance program?

The auditor general has said the unemployment rate is one and a half per cent to three per cent higher than it should be because of what the government is doing. It does not make the changes. Why is the Bloc not targeting that problem?

Instead we go on about other things. We have some simple cosmetic changes that have been made like how many jobs does changing the name from unemployment to employment insurance create? Not one. In fact it destroys jobs because we now have to raise taxes. We have to do all these name changes on all the buildings, on all the letterhead and all this kind of thing. That extra tax will destroy more jobs.

We are not addressing the fundamental problem of why we have such a high unemployment rate. We are being taxed to death and the government is using the unemployment insurance system as simply another tax to run some of its favourite programs.

Those are the fundamental questions that should be asked. The Bloc should be asking those questions if it wants to claim to be official opposition in the House.

[Translation]

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I agree with some aspects of what the previous speaker said. Canadians have every right to criticize the present Liberal government because it was elected on a platform of jobs, jobs, jobs, but in the end it is just coasting. It creates jobs piecemeal, while just as many are being lost, so that net job creation is zero.

This government plays a lot with words, and I think that is significant. Instead of unemployment insurance it now talks about employment insurance, but for heaven's sake, the contents should match what it says on the label. There should be something to help evaluate the impact in terms of job creation and helping us to get out of this mess.

We in the Bloc Québécois are concerned about job creation. We see in these reforms a lot of measures that will have a negative impact on job creation, including the fact that young people who come on the labour market and fail to accumulate 910 hours will remain dependent, will go back on welfare and will become part of the welfare cycle. This is wrong and lends

further credence to the fact that this is a lost generation, and that, we cannot accept.

We in the Bloc Québécois have a different perception of employment. We agree with the Reform Party in some respects. There is also a structural and organizational problem in Canada.

We have developed a system in which one government has the power to collect taxes and spend money in jurisdictions it does not know and does not control, and has developed a fantastic bureaucracy to be able to function. This has created a lot of public service jobs but today, at the operational level, we realize this no longer works. Yes, we have a problem with the plumbing. We will have to deal with a number of things, but we also have a problem with the architecture: I am referring to the fact that governments do not have clearcut jurisdictions.

From the federalist point of view, which I do not share, one could say it is entirely normal that in Canada international relations come under the jurisdiction of a federal Parliament. However, manpower is not an area in which the federal government can be effective, and this is borne out by unemployment rates that are unacceptable, that are much too high and that show a significant spread. There are marked differences between the regions in central Canada and around the federal government, and more distant regions.

The maritimes, Quebec and other regions outside larger urban centres always seem to have higher unemployment rates than the metropolitan areas. The system puts the regions at a disadvantage, which means that young people must look for employment elsewhere. If we keep the 910-hour standard, you will see a large number of young people between the ages of 18 and 23 who may have managed to get summer jobs in their own regions but will have to leave to get jobs in the city, and we are just going to aggravate this exodus.

• (1345)

Yes, the Bloc is concerned about employment, but as far as the solutions are concerned, we think it is also a matter of the structure and management of manpower training and also the fact that it should be more closely related to the needs of the people concerned and integrated with our educational resources.

When we have a government like the one in Quebec that is responsible for the Labour Code, for occupational health and safety legislation and for labour standards, and we have another government that is going to introduce five measures dealing with issues such as wage subsidies and income supplements, this will further complicate the system. Someone somewhere in the Department of Human Resources Development will then be able to say he is an expert on something no one else understands.

This means he can justify his job, but this is not efficient, and in North America we can no longer afford to operate this way. If we want to be competitive on international markets, decision making must be brought as close as possible to the people. That