

Supply

After setting forth the main principles that I have just described briefly, our government had to implement them, which means fund them. We have done so.

The 1992-93 budget provides \$3.4 billion for activities related to occupational training and employment. With these funds, an increase from \$3.1 billion the year before, Employment and Immigration Canada will be able to help some 650,000 people, a very significant number, you will agree.

Funds for training will increase by \$300 million. This will be done by favouring active assistance over passive support measures, and in co-operation with the private sector. In this way we will ensure that Canadians are provided more effective training.

In 1992, under this completely new financing method, \$400 million more in UI funds will be used for productive purposes. This increase brings total spending to \$1.8 billion, three times as much as in 1990. The remaining \$1.6 billion will be used for employment planning.

Mr. Speaker, I just spoke to you about some initiatives in Montreal. Let us take some more examples, because they hold valuable lessons for us all. As the saying goes, it is sometimes better to lead by example.

In Fort McMurray nine native people each earned over \$40,000 a year working full time in a tar sands processing plant. They were hired after taking a power station mechanic's course subsidized by Employment and Immigration. The course that helped them acquire the skills they needed cost \$40, 000 but yielded more than \$300,000 in annual income.

I have another example. In New Westminster, a number of women receiving unemployment insurance benefits are also receiving training in a non-traditional and lucrative field: butchering.

This training is provided thanks to the productive use of unemployment insurance funds and the sponsorship of the International Union of Food and Allied Workers Associations.

This is another instance of partnership that works to the satisfaction of all concerned. The government, in partnership with all players in the labour market, has committed itself to providing an effective and comprehensive response to the requirements of Canadians for skill development and adjustment.

[*English*]

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the remarks of the member for Laval-Ouest.

I think it is fair to say we are facing some very serious problems as a country, as an economy, and some major readjustments have to occur. The government is right when it talks about the problem of the deficit that it inherited. Indeed, some of the policies of the Liberal government during the 1970s were totally irresponsible. Some of the investment in R and D, the retooling, et cetera, that should have occurred in the 1970s did not occur. It was spending money and really the cause of the deficit in the 1970s was due more to the tax breaks the Liberals created. There was a dramatic reduction in revenues from the corporate side, particularly the financial institutions, the banks, life insurance companies and so forth.

This government has been in power now for almost a decade and we have to ask, what it has done. What sort of leadership has it provided? I am afraid it is not a good record. First of all, this government started on the wrong ideological bent. This party was taken over when the present leader and the Prime Minister captured the party, I suspect with a lot of financial and technological support from south of the border and the right wing part of the Republican Party. It launched the Conservative Party into something that was alien to Canadian politics, a new right wing agenda.

The agenda was that government did not have a role to play. For a long period of time we did not see any leadership whatsoever. To tell the truth, I think what saved perhaps some semblance of public responsibility was the Quebec members in this government because the Quebec members never did buy into that American right wing philosophy. The member from Laval-Ouest talks about some traditional Conservative philosophy but I am afraid the agenda of this government as a whole has been an agenda of the new right wing and that has been a disaster for Canada in the 1980s.

The member talks about a long-term approach. I do not see a long-term approach in this government. Members can see the reductions in science and in education. If we are going to save this country and save meaningful jobs we need R and D and yet we have a dismal record in R and D.