

to build the building so that we can have information networks, but their view is very narrow. They do not see beyond spades and shovels. I find that very disturbing.

When we talk about small and medium-sized businesses, for example, we have known for a long time that more than 85 per cent of jobs come from such businesses. We know that these businesses need capital. We know that they need to invest in research. We know that they need to group together and that is what we are doing. It is too bad that my colleagues in the Bloc do not understand that it is happening.

Why did they not talk about summer jobs that will increase by 20 per cent? Did they not know? Are they badly informed? Do they not have a research office? Do they not talk about it? What is going on? Did they talk about the Youth Service Corps? No, they did not! Did they talk about the apprenticeship program? No, they did not! There are so many good things that could have been mentioned, but no, all they see is doom and gloom. What a pity!

Maybe the hon. member would like to react to what I said. If I misunderstood, I will gladly apologize with a big smile.

Mrs. Guay: Madam Speaker, our dear parliamentary secretary certainly has acting talents. He sings even while talking to us.

About the fat, he may not like that term, but it refers to tax shelters, to family trusts and that sort of thing. It is not mentioned explicitly but that is what it is about.

• (1615)

That is where cuts should be made to be able to invest, to invest in jobs, in social housing, in social housing construction projects. We have been given the same old song and dance about social housing since the beginning by this Parliament. No investment has been made in new social housing units. From one year to the next, CMHC is allotted exactly the same \$2 billion budget to administer. A \$100 million amount is earmarked over two years for RRAP, the residential rehabilitation assistance program for home buyers. We know our programs, Madam Speaker. There is no need to tell us what we already know. We know.

Our research services work very well. They are really very efficient. All I have to say is that certain projects, some section 25 projects, these DEPs we all use in our committees—

An hon. member: Are you going to cut them?

Mrs. Guay: They intend to cut even the DEP program. Liberal members will have nothing left to give their voters. Of course, there are summer job programs, but that is not enough. These programs do not create permanent jobs. Summer jobs are only temporary.

Supply

Steady jobs must be created, high-tech jobs, in areas where there are vacancies right now and no one to fill them. Above all, we have to create these jobs through manpower training, our own program, the one already in place in Quebec and that we are fighting to keep.

Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul): I hear my hon. colleague opposite say that she is familiar with section 25 programs and with direct employment programs and that she uses them. Well, I use them too and I am a Liberal. I am a French Canadian and I use both of these initiatives, direct employment programs and section 25 programs. Since I was elected, 38 permanent jobs have been created in two small and medium-sized businesses in my riding. I would be curious to know how many jobs the hon. member opposite has created in her riding since taking office?

Mrs. Guay: I am not sure I understand the hon. member's question, but I will say what is being done in my riding to boost employment. Direct employment programs and section 25 programs are temporary measures. They are designed to help certain unemployment insurance and welfare recipients get back into the labour force.

In my view, which I believe is shared by several of my colleagues, these programs do not create long-term jobs. They were introduced to help people for a certain period of time, perhaps six months. Some programs have lasted one year, but there are no guarantees that the employer will ask an employee to stay on.

People often benefit from a section 25 initiative and then go back on unemployment for six months or a year. These are not effective programs. They do exist and we do use them because people need food to eat and a roof over their heads. Of course we will use these programs for as long as they exist. After all, they are paid for with our tax dollars, yours and mine.

[English]

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, I am not sure if it has been 10 minutes or 20 minutes that has been allotted to me. If it is 20 minutes, I would like to split the time and give the last 10 minutes to the member for Vancouver East.

It is a pleasure for me to speak this afternoon to the motion put forward by the Bloc Québécois on job creation. If we are to listen to my colleagues in the Bloc, it would be our belief that the opposition believes that this government has no plan for job creation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The entire Liberal platform as outlined in the red book is about job creation. I and every other Liberal member of Parliament campaigned for 47 days about job creation with a concrete plan of action. No government in Canadian history has moved as quickly as this government has to create jobs. For over two years the government has advocated a \$6 billion cost shared program to improve public infrastructure in Canada. Just two months