

two offices are in a real mess. They do not want to go near them at all and they are becoming leery of the whole operation.

• (1620)

I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming. The money provided in this estimate would be better spent if the government were to use it directly in trying to create jobs, rather than using it for all these rather questionable ways of retraining people for non-existent jobs. By the time they are retrained the jobs have disappeared, and we have to start retraining them for something else. We are trying to stick our finger in the dike, but the pressure on the other side of the dike is far too great.

I suggest that we attack the problem directly by using these funds to establish secondary industry, for example, in the Sudbury area. There is no reason in the world why all the raw materials should be shipped away from Sudbury to Sweden, Norway, Japan and the United States, where the finished products are made, and this at a time when our own people remain unemployed. Jobs in secondary manufacturing should be provided in a mining area like Sudbury. In the last two years, we have seen many mining towns become ghost towns. There was the example of Coniston, and now Cobalt is closing down.

It seems to me that the whole approach taken by the government has been designed to deal with symptoms rather than with the problem. The only way to solve unemployment is by directing public funds into the establishment of factories, if private enterprise will not establish them. And private enterprise will not establish factories as long as the same multinational corporations that own the mines in Canada own and operate factories somewhere else. I repeat that government funds should be used to establish industry and provide job opportunities for our people. With the present system we will end up with one plaster on top of another, all covering the body cancerous, until the whole becomes an immense patchwork quilt. In such a situation even the bureaucracy begins to lose control of itself.

For this reason, I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming that the estimate be cut to \$1 until some study is undertaken to show that spending money this way is effective in solving unemployment.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: The hon. member for Portneuf.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, will you look this way a little later on to be fair about it.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Portneuf.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for the floor.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

Supply

The Chairman: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

Mr. Lundrigan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The musical intonations from the recognition of the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate bring me no end of pleasure.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Lundrigan: I have often wondered if the weather has any effect on the attitudes of Members of Parliament and on the proceedings in this chamber. It has an effect on the bird population. Some fly south to escape the winter cold. Today, it seems that some of the NDP have taken leave of their traditional senses in moving a motion which is the most inexplicable thing that I have seen the NDP do since I came to the House of Commons five years ago. In fact, I had to reread Vote 5a in order to be sure we were talking about the same thing. It deals with "training provided to adult employees under section 6 of the Adult Occupational Training Act." Today, the minister confirmed that over \$10 million is for on-the-job training, and I have just heard the hon. member for Nickel Belt say this item should be reduced to \$1.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member has referred to the particular details of the vote, does he recognize that the motion which has been proposed does not do away with the vote? It leaves what is sometimes referred to as a dollar item, which gives the government authority to operate a program. Doesn't he realize that the motion does not cut off the authority of the government to carry through with that program?

Mr. Nielsen: Rubbish.

Mr. Barnett: Since the hon. member is suggesting that what we have proposed is inexplicable, would he not agree that we often vote \$1 items which provide the government with authority to carry out programs? The purpose of the motion is to shift the onus to the government to find the \$11 million out of the more than \$200 million already voted.

Mr. Lundrigan: I agree with the embarrassment expressed by the hon. member. That is the only way I can describe his intervention. His question is rhetorical. If you take away the funds, the program does not really exist. Really what he is saying is that he is very embarrassed about it, even though he just spoke in support of the motion.

The hon. member for Nickel Belt has told us that the people in his area are all well educated, that there is no need for involvement with little people, and that the unions are against this kind of program. When he was speaking one of my colleagues said that the NDP has gone into debt with the unions and not only with the Liberals. I would ask the hon. member if the steel workers in his riding all agree with his stand?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman—