Oral Questions

What is at issue is the credibility of this minister and of his government. We have been told time and time again that this government is committed to training and retraining. If that is the case, can he explain why the directors general sent a memo on December 20, 1991 asking areas managers right across the country to prepare contingency plans for three scenarios: (1) a 20 per cent reduction, (2) a 35 per cent reduction and (3) a 50 per cent reduction in community based training funds?

• (1430)

Can the Minister of Finance explain this discrepancy? Why is the minister saying one thing in the House of Commons when his area managers are being told another thing down at street level?

[Translation]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr. Speaker, I have a list of investments that we made in training our workers: programs like job development, which got \$257 million in 1991; community development, \$150 million; job entry, \$412 million. Mr Speaker, we gave out some \$19 billion in income support last year. What we are trying to do is to build an economy in which our workers can find employment and we do not intend to cut our programs.

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is a phoney. He stands in this House and he says that his government is committed to training.

I would like the Minister of Finance to have the courage to stand and explain to the thousands of people who rely on these training programs why this government has decided to cut \$100 million from community based training and why the area manager in the Toronto region says in a memo dated January 10, 1992: "We will be forced to terminate projects due to budgetary reductions".

Can the Minister of Finance explain to these people who are desperate for jobs and who want to be trained in order to fill those 300,000 vacancies that the Minister of Finance spoke about yesterday why this minister is

cutting them down? Can he explain why he is cutting \$100 million from community based training?

[Translation]

Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)): Mr. Speaker, last year we invested \$3 billion in worker training and in the coming year we definitely intend to continue working with the private sector, the provinces and especially the workers, who must do their part to find work and register for our training courses.

[English]

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister for International Trade.

We have just learned that a preliminary U.S. customs report has ruled that Canadian built Honda Civics do not meet the North American content requirements set out in the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement and will be subject to a 2.5 per cent tariff.

I ask the minister: Doesn't this show that the free trade agreement is not providing the secure access to the American market for Canada which was its original justification by his government? Isn't this an example of rising U.S. protectionism and a blatant attempt to discourage future automotive investment in Canada?

Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to my counterpart in the United States as has the ambassador. We have both made very, very clear our dissatisfaction at the way this audit has been conducted and the results of the audit. Once we see what the specific elements of the audit are, if it is appropriate we will take action under the terms of the free trade agreement.

Let me also say that we do have protections under the free trade agreement which we would not have had through the dispute settlement mechanism provisions, as well as the elements of the U.S.-Canada Trade Commission where we can discuss these things, get them resolved, and not leave them outstanding as was the case prior to the free trade agreement coming into place.