

share, which could amount to \$50 million per year according to his parliamentary secretary. The government must—and I emphasize this—be held responsible, and this portion of the bill must be deleted, because grain producers are going to lose faith in the government if they do not receive fair play.

Promises are not good enough—promises that three, four, five or six years ahead the government will have not only to pay in their portion to the fund but also will have to reimburse the treasury for that portion for which the producers may be liable. I am sure everyone realizes that our economy will not be in good condition if the time ever comes that we have to pay out from this fund. It means our economy is going to be in the doldrums and will be a load on the taxpayers if it has to pay back money which should have been paid in this year or next year as the program continues.

If the government cannot afford to make the payments now when times are good, how will it make them when the going gets tough, Mr. Speaker? It is irresponsible for any government to bring in this type of legislation and renege on payment. This is not the way business operates in Canada. What would happen if a business reneged on payment of income tax? The Department of National Revenue would move in and freeze its bank account. I am sure all members of parliament have had to deal with such situations.

If the federal government, through the Department of National Revenue, has the right to freeze bank accounts and finances of citizens, those citizens should have the right to move in and freeze a certain part of the revenue of Canada. We have to hold this minister responsible for at least this part of the bill, Mr. Speaker. It is of fundamental importance that we do not allow the government to adopt this unbusinesslike practice of delaying payments which are due. I am sure even the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) would agree that at all costs the government must make its payments current, and keep them current, because the fate of producers is at stake.

The cost of farm labour is increasing and it is becoming more and more difficult to get people to work. I think that is true of industry as well. I am sure all members realize that it is becoming difficult to get educated people, trained people and technologists to do the jobs which are required in business in this country. It has been said, and I think correctly so, that a person has to be re-educated, that life is a continuing sphere of education and that we have to develop certain educational attributes five or six times during a lifetime.

It would, therefore, seem penny wise and pound foolish for the government to cut \$20 million from the Manpower training program when labour, business and agriculture are demanding a higher degree of technical ability. While this \$20 million is being cut from the training program, the budget of the unemployment insurance fund is being increased by \$700 million. This just does not make sense, Mr. Speaker. Surely we are moving in the wrong direction. We should be retraining personnel and giving them the opportunity to work into our technical system. If we are to continue in the forefront of technology in the world today, we must continue to train

Restraint of Government Expenditures

people. We must adapt to situations and circumstances and participate in the development of this land of which we are so justly proud and in which we all have the right to participate.

Mr. S. Victor Railton (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the opposition criticizing and attacking. That is their function, I suppose; but if they would be a little more practical and offer some real suggestions, I think they would be well received not only by the government but by the people of Canada.

As far as the restraint policy is concerned and the way it is outlined in Bill C-19, it embodies a firm intention to reduce spending, not only the budgetary and statutory items but also non-statutory items. The budget has been increasing at a rate of 20 per cent to 24 per cent, but it will be cut down to 16 per cent.

Of course, the government does not admit, nor does any economist, that government spending is the cause of the present level of inflation. We must keep repeating this because people try to cloud the issue by saying government spending is the cause of the trouble. I repeat, inflation is worldwide and it was going up at an acceptable, although deplorable, rate even before the OPEC countries quadrupled oil prices. Since that price rise came into effect, inflation has run rampant. Even so, this government has led this country down a well-lit path of economic stability. It is about time hon. members opposite realized this.

● (1130)

The government is being criticized for its record on unemployment, but one must realize that our record with regard to the rate of increase of unemployment is still one of the best in the industrialized western world. Naturally, an unemployment rate of 6 per cent or 7.5 per cent is not acceptable or desirable, but if you want to be honest you will concede, after examining all the facts, that our record is among the best. The same can be said of our rate of inflation and standard of living.

Mr. McKinnon: We are not number one in that regard. The United States is number one.

Mr. Railton: The hon. member says the United States is number one. I expect hon. members opposite to criticize us, but I would prefer hearing good advice which we could follow. I have heard hon. members opposite offer much criticism, but since 1972 I have heard few suggestions as to what they would do if they were in our place. One wonders how gullible the opposition thinks the people of Canada are. Of course, not only opposition members opposite criticize us; the media also acts as a secondary opposition, taking it upon itself to criticize the government when it thinks we are not doing an adequate job. Mr. Speaker, we can take criticism because we know we are providing good government.

We must realize that democratic government in any country of the industrialized world is a most tenuous affair these days. I should like to know what the opposition would do if they were in our place. I keep asking the opposition that question