

funds have been reduced, that the training for the unemployed, as projected, has been reduced by \$100 million at a time when unemployment has exceeded 10 per cent.

The government has on a variety of fronts attempted to diminish the universality of several important social programs. As I said earlier, the 500,000 jobs promised by the Prime Minister flowing from the free trade deal have not materialized.

I will conclude by making this point. In the first year of the free trade agreement operations, 179 Canadian corporations were taken over. Obviously, when a Canadian corporation is owned by a foreign company in difficult economic times, what does it do? The first thing that happens is the parent company closes down the subsidiaries abroad. This is in part what is happening in Canada in the over-all picture.

Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague on a very good speech. We on this side realize very well that this government is not paying attention, that it says one thing and always does another.

I want to remind my colleague of the promises made during the 1988 debate on the effects of the free trade agreement and the promises of adjustment funds and job creation initiatives on the part of the government to help ease the transition. Perhaps my colleague would like to add comments concerning these questions.

Mr. Caccia: I thank my hon. colleague from Sudbury. I have also been looking around for the instruments the government would be looking to in order to make unemployed people employable, provided they have a skill, by way of improved education and training skills of our work force.

Today, unfortunately, we have to conclude—and on the basis again of international studies—that Canada is less well-equipped than it was six years ago to meet the challenges of the future, because of budget cuts, which are really made and invoked in the name of a financial deficit, without taking into account the human deficit these cuts are causing, because of people remaining idle and unable to be productive, to maintain themselves and their families. Thus, the losses that are, in human terms, inflicted upon people because of an enormous preoccupation with an illusive deficit cut which this government has not been able to come to grips with, while at the

Supply

same time allowing a human deficit to expand and to increase enormously day by day and month by month, as a result of such narrow-minded policies.

• (1710)

The *Report on Business* from *The Globe and Mail* cannot be cited as a revolutionary source of data. In the March issue, on page 30 is the lay-off list expected by *The Globe and Mail* business magazine for Canada over the next while, and the figures are astonishingly depressing.

Between the big three automakers, there is a projected lay-off of 14,000; in the steel industry, an estimated 3,000 to 4,000; Air Canada, 3,000; Canadian National Railways, 2,200; Rio Algom, 1,700; Pratt and Whitney Canada Inc., 1,200; Sears Canada, Shell Canada, Imperial Oil, forest products, you name it, a phenomenal number of projected lay-offs which will occur in our economy, as predicted by an organization which has its feet solidly on the ground.

Evidently the solution would have to come from the proposal just outlined by the member from Sudbury. We are waiting for the evidence on the part of the government to prove to us that it intends to proceed along those lines.

Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science): It will only take me a minute, Mr. Speaker.

I just cannot help but comment on what an interesting reversal we have; all these comments from our colleagues on the Liberal side talking about training, et cetera. I cannot help but remind them that they were the group that held up Bill C-21, they were the group that patted their Liberal colleagues on the back, they were all such a grand bunch of ladies and gentlemen down there, holding up Bill C-21; \$800 million worth of training funds held up by them because they were so concerned about training and education.

This is the same group that in 1977—and I say this to my colleague from Sudbury—gave away the Government of Canada's right to direct where EPF was going to go, gave it away as a block so the provinces could use it on highways or on anything they wanted. This is the same bunch now moaning all these marvellous things about training and education.

There is a word I cannot say in this Chamber, but, oh my, it does reek a little.