

Adjournment Debate

Accessible and Airdrie Ecological Assessment. In other words, it was most frustrating last year for the 16 organizations that drew up proposals and went to the work and expense of presenting the proposals only to be told that there was not enough money to approve them.

What will the situation be this year? The Minister praises the program and builds up the hopes of the people who apply. Then they are frustrated and disillusioned. This year, with only \$100,000, it means only about three projects will be approved, with about 12 to 15 new jobs being created. This leaves more than 1,800 people without work. This is certainly a "bizarre" result.

● (1805)

If we were to receive an amount comparable to that of last year, we would have \$600,000 or at the very least \$500,000. The bizarre way of figuring this out by the new Minister of Employment and Immigration is an insult to the unemployed and an insult to the communities which are going to make applications. This program is a hoax.

If the Minister cannot do any better than this in the Employment and Immigration portfolio, then he should resign. The Minister has never had to meet a payroll. He has never been in business. He does not understand the outside world at all. Perhaps he should leave us and go back behind the sheltered walls of the university and find out how to work out a sensible formula, one which will be fair and one which will raise the grant as the number of unemployed increase.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, regarding the first question put by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), I want to inform the Hon. Member that in 1982-1983, the funds allocated to Canada Community Development Projects, totalling \$172.5 million, were distributed as follows: first, all ridings received a basic grant of \$200,000. Second, ridings with a labour surplus rate of less than 12 per cent over four years received funding for job creation, and this was the case in 33 ridings. Third, ridings with an average monthly labour surplus rate of five per cent or more during the period from October 1981 to March 1982 received a share of the remaining funds calculated according to the difference between the average number of surplus workers during the six-month period ending in March 1981 and during the corresponding period in 1982.

Under the Canada Community Development Programs, Bow River received a basic grant of \$200,000. The riding was not eligible for job creation funding, because the average labour surplus rate over four years was 1 per cent. Nor was it eligible for an additional share of the grant, because the average monthly labour surplus rate was 1.4 per cent. The difference in the number of surplus workers in Bow River was 236.

This year, funding for Canada Works and LEAD programs was distributed as follows: first, all ridings received a basic grant of \$100,000. Second, ridings with an average labour surplus rate over four years of less than 12 per cent were eligible for LEAD program funding. This was the case in 37 ridings. Third, the remaining funds were distributed proportionally among the ridings where the labour surplus rate exceeded 8 per cent of the labour force. Under the Canada Works and LEAD programs, Bow River again received a basic grant of \$100,000. It was not eligible for funding under LEAD, because its average labour surplus rate over four years was 1.7 per cent. Although the number of surplus workers was calculated at 1,893, the riding did not receive an additional share of the grant because its monthly average labour surplus rate was 3.5 per cent. The difference between the amounts allocated to Bow River is therefore due to the fact that the basic grant dropped from \$200,000 to \$100,000 this year. There are two reasons for the reduction: first, funding for the Canada Works Program was only \$109.8 million. Second, since the labour surplus increased last year because of the economic situation, it was necessary to make more substantial funding available to all ridings. Thence the figure of \$100,000 for the riding of Bow River. As to whether the same formula was applied to ridings represented by Liberal Members, the answer is that funding for all ridings is calculated in the same way, namely, basic grants of \$100,000 for everyone, and depending on the labour surplus rate, certain amounts are allocated under other programs such as LEAD, and that is how funding for the riding of Bow River was allocated.

PENITENTIARIES—DECISION TO END LAVAL UNIVERSITY
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AT LAVAL PENAL INSTITUTE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I questioned the Solicitor General about the excellent education program offered by Laval University at the Laval Institution in Quebec City. In his reply, the Solicitor General mentioned that the BAGIL program directed by Mr. Mario Ferland, which was set up at Laval and offered to a number of inmates, had not been very successful during the three years of its operation.

Mr. Speaker, I find this conclusion very surprising, since the Minister wrote the following letter to Mr. Ferland on September 14 of this year, in which he said, and I quote:

I wish to thank you very much for your efforts in developing BAGIL at the Laval Institution. I am aware that, thanks to your efforts, it has become an excellent program that has been beneficial to inmate participants.

● (1810)

Mr. Speaker, there is clearly a considerable discrepancy between what the Solicitor General said in the House last Friday and what he wrote in his letter to Mr. Ferland a month ago, when he described the program as being an excellent one. The question arises why the Minister decided to terminate the