

*Government Orders*

This is not only a question of passing the burden on to provincial governments. This is a question of passing on a burden to the country, a burden that it will be paying for years to come because as I said initially, the world does not owe us a free lunch. Other governments, whether in Europe or in the Asia Pacific, are not only meeting their words with money, but are beginning to certainly have a greater spread between their countries, their economies, their training, their apprenticeship programs and us. Europe 1992 has arrived. It is here. They are getting their act together. We still do not have free trade among our provinces. We have got to wake up. When I say "we", I mean our country. I mean this Parliament that speaks on behalf of the country, at least as it speaks today and hopefully in the future.

• (1720)

If we truly want to equip our youth with the best education, if we truly wish to equip Canadian citizens with training and apprenticeship programs, then why over the last number of years have these transfer payments been far under the rate of inflation or the growth of our GNP? Why? The question will come back to haunt us.

This government is always looking back and always taking things out of 1981 and 1972 and 1953. The challenge for this government today is not to be an erroneous historian. The challenge for this government is to have a breath of vision for things to come. On that score the budget was a failure and Bill C-60 is a failure.

**Mr. René Soetens (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment because I am rather displeased with what I heard.

I heard the comment that the hon. member does not want us to refer back to 1981, 1982 or 1983, so I will not. I will respect that wish.

He did refer back, of course, to our period in government, starting in 1984. He talked about the fact that we have been cutting transfer payments and we have not kept pace with the rate of inflation and so on.

The member is from Ontario. I believe his riding is York West. I think I have the name of the riding correct. It is close, anyway. I represent a riding in Ontario as well, not too far removed from his.

I note, based on information that is readily available, that the Government of Canada transferred to the

province of Ontario in the period between 1984 and 1991-92 some \$9.9 billion, which over that period of time was a 62 per cent increase in funding, well in excess of the rate of inflation.

I would caution the member that when all of that increase took place those problems he has referenced with regard to training and education programs were in fact there and were not being addressed by all the money being thrown at them.

I would like to comment a little further. He stated that our budget had no recognition for those who are unemployed, the problems of the economy, no stimulus, no incentive. I think he used no plus some other adjective about eight or ten times about how this budget was a disaster.

I rise to say that I am sorry if he did not relate to his constituents how this budget was good for his riding, good for my riding and good for all those ridings in Ontario where there is extensive manufacturing. In the manufacturing sector we have improved the capital cost allowance. That is good for investment. That is good for job creation. We have reduced the withholding tax on manufacturers' dividends. That is positive for manufacturing. We have also cut the income tax rate for manufacturers.

I do not know if General Motors is very big in his riding but out my way General Motors has a significant employee base, along with Chrysler and many multinational manufacturing companies. We have just cut the income tax rate. That is good for job creation by those companies.

We have developed a small business financing bond, a venture capital fund. We have enlarged the small business development loan. All of those things are good for Ontario.

I am sorry that the member decided that he would ignore all of those good things for Ontario in his comments about our budget.

Finally, he talked about training and education. We have allotted some \$3.4 billion in federal funding toward training and retraining programs for the work force.

I say to the member, I do not want to look back because I respect his comment. What I would like him to do is look forward. There is the federal \$3.4 billion going directly into training. He does not want us to mortgage the future. He does not want us to be irresponsible and