

Supply

point. I simply want to make sure that the Minister understood, in answering the question which he has undertaken to do—and I appreciate that very much—the nature of my question. I am concerned, as are many others, about the process by which the \$150 million has been spent. If the Minister would have a member of his staff get in touch with the Employment and Immigration Department, they would advise him that the immediate employment stimulation program is not really a program because it does not have an official application form, an official public application procedure. Most of the job-creation programs that the Minister was describing are characterized by a public application form and a public procedure, so people know how money is being spent. This particular program, at best, is shrouded in mystery, and I would like to ask the Minister to make sure I am provided with a description of the process by which the \$150 million was spent.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a perfectly fair question. No expenditure of taxpayers' funds by any Government should be shrouded in mystery, and if the Hon. Member feels that it is I will try to clarify the mystery for him, although, as I say, it is not directly within my area of jurisdiction. But I will certainly raise the matter with my colleague.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short question for the Minister. In his comments I think he was reading off a long list of plusses for the Government and actions they had taken. He mentioned the Chrysler diesel plant and I do not think he really meant that. I think he is aware there is some reverse action being taken on that, and he should clarify that.

The second question I want to put to him is this. One of the difficulties I am running into in my constituency is not only that I have untrained and unskilled people applying for unemployment, but I also have a large number of trained individuals, that is, engineers, architects, certified electrical and mechanical technicians, welders, millwrights and people who have industrial skills. Some of them are going in for retraining. How we are going to retrain them is the point, and what are we going to do with those people who were at a fairly high level of income for a good number of years, and who in many cases held senior positions, but now find themselves not only unemployed but unemployable?

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tie that question to my very brief and perhaps over-simplified explanation of unemployment. It is clear in the case of these skilled people to whom the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) makes reference that the recession effectively has had an impact on their companies and their jobs. As we see a turnaround in the economy, we will expect to see those skilled people certainly back as active participants in the workforce. There may be exceptions to that. The technological revolution we have talked about has created a need for different kinds of skills and training. As I mentioned, that problem has to be identified and pursued in terms of recycling, retraining and computer training. Many corporations are now doing this in-

house, such as the 3M Corporation in London, Ontario has undertaken for its employees. This is the way we have to move. People must have these new skills to take on these new challenges.

● (1450)

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister, not that I agree with what he was saying, but for the way he said it. Also, he was prepared to engage in a debate. We had a real debate this afternoon, and I congratulate him for that.

What disturbs me is that industries just do not appear. Because you want a hi-tech industry in Sudbury, it is not going to suddenly appear there. People in places such as Sudbury will get short-term jobs which really do not mean very much in the long run. Private investment is not working. Is the Minister prepared to do what some other countries have done in order to compete, namely, to plan investment priorities? In other words, to commit ourselves to a planned investment economy?

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. I said earlier that I felt from the comments we heard before lunch that the Hon. Member was not rooted in the ideology of his Party. Perhaps his true colours are showing when he talks about a planned economy. I would be the last to agree that private investment is not working. Private investment will work. It will always work when the appropriate investment climate has been created. That appropriate investment climate requires a reduction in inflation which, of course, is the purpose and point of the six and five program.

As inflation and interest rates fall, I have no concern about the private sector making investments in areas that are of interest to all Members of this House, certainly in terms of job creation and economic growth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I should advise the House that the ten-minute exchange period has more than expired. I tried to be particularly generous with it because of the points of order that occurred earlier. It is time now that I recognize the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta.

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the foregoing discussions on procedure were essential. But it is also the wish of members of this Party to have adequate time to deal with the motion before the House, a motion which "condemns the Government for its callous disregard and tragic neglect of the dire social and economic plight of over two million Canadians". The Minister responsible for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston) appears to be leaving the Chamber. I had hoped he would stay because I want to respond to some of the remarks he made concerning his policies on science and technology in particular and industrial development in general.

Contrary to the implication and the verbiage of the Minister who just spoke, we do have a serious economic problem in Canada today. I challenge any Member of the Liberal Government to deny that there is a serious problem, far more serious