

substantially increasing the amount going into summer employment by 20 per cent so we can say to young people: "Go back to school and we will help you get a job to get there".

That does not come easy. We have reallocated money. We have brought together another \$20 million which will mean that over 60,000 young people this summer will have an opportunity for employment sponsored in a wide variety of circumstances. When the opposition says we have no plans or actions, I say we just announced another one today as part of a broadly based scheme.

It is interesting that not once did we have a question from members of the Bloc or members of the Reform Party about summer employment and what we are going to do with summer students. They were so deeply concerned about our young people they never got around to asking questions about that. They have only been here for a couple of months but they never quite got around to the question of what will be happening to young people this coming summer.

• (1340)

Members of Parliament in my own caucus asked me about it every week. They had the good sense and understanding of what was happening to young people, and that is one reason the government responded to its own caucus.

The question of employment will take a real effort by many Canadians. I hope the committee will report this week on what it heard from a broad base of consultation in the first phase. We are also negotiating seriously with all the provinces to talk about how we change training programs and how we change social security to get people back into the workplace.

We are meeting with a wide variety of advisory groups. In the past two weeks I have met with 15 different groups across the country.

[Translation]

Today, comprehensive consultations are being held in Montreal with several social groups to discuss changes relating to the social security net.

[English]

We are talking to Canadians to involve them and to say that change is necessary but we can do it together. We can do it as a country united in the fundamental objective of getting people back to work and of restoring the dignity of work.

The only people absent from the debate, the only people who seem to be withholding their participation, are members of the opposition. They do not seem to think it is important enough to look seriously at how we can change our social assistance system by giving incentives to go back to work. They do not think it is important enough to be looking at what is happening to young people in our society. They do not think it is important enough to look at long term unemployment and how to get a much better mix of programming to deal with the problem. All

Supply

they want to ensure is that there is somebody to go to the barricades, organize a demonstration and say: "Stay with what you have". Fortunately that is not the message of Canadians.

We are listening to the people who are not in the extreme groups on the left or the right. It is interesting that one group of people on the far right is saying that we should trash every program we can find and the group on the left is saying that we should keep every program we have. Fortunately a large group of Canadians in the middle say that change is necessary but it should be done responsibly and carefully so that we can get the country back to work again.

I ask members opposite to help create a climate in which there can be jobs for Canadians. They should help to put together the building blocks of an employment strategy that recognizes the creation of employment in the private sector, that relieves the burden of payroll taxes, that has a specific target for the long term unemployed, that looks seriously at a child care system, that enables women to participate fully with a sense of security and that works in dealing with our young people.

If we can put those elements together, if we can put the right package together over the next several months, we will create a new vision for the country. We will have given Canadians a new sense of identity. It will not be tied up with some kind of false debate about the Constitution, who controls this or who is responsible for that. The fundamental point is that we will have restored for Canadians a sense of hope and opportunity that they, their families and their kids can go back to work. That is the real meaning of what the country is about, and we intend to do it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I take note of the number of members interested in asking questions of the minister. I will try to accommodate as many as possible. I would ask members to keep in mind the great interest stimulated by the intervention of the minister.

[Translation]

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Minister of Human Resources Development, and not Natural Resources as I said last week. In any case, I wonder if ministers have any real powers, regardless of the department.

So, I listened carefully to the minister, whom I have known for some time now. I must say that he is very articulate and he sounds convincing but, once again, the content of the red book and the speeches we hear every day are the absolute opposite of reality. I must first ask the minister how he thinks he can create jobs by, on the one hand, investing one billion dollars in infrastructures and, on the other hand, taxing UI benefits for the unemployed, to the order of \$800 million for 1994-95, following changes to UI which is within the scope of his department. What does that mean? It means that, on one hand, the purchasing power of Canadians is reduced by \$800 million while, on the other hand, one billion dollars is invested in infrastructures.