

need debating and commenting on. The time is short so I will come quickly to two points.

The first is something that the gentleman from Burlington said, but I want to put a question to the gentleman from Fredericton about it and that relates to job strategy. I say to him let's distinguish between the Canadian Jobs Strategy program and the Community Futures. These are two very different programs with very different results.

Community Futures is a good program as I said to this House before and said publicly. It is a good program. It has a lot of potential. There are some problems with it including the monkeying around at times with who goes on the board, but that is a side issue. We should not throw out the baby with the bath water. The program itself is a good program if it is given a chance to succeed.

The Canadian Jobs Strategy program must be marvelous for places like Burlington and Toronto and so on. What I can tell you is that it is creating unbelievable havoc in the small communities throughout southern, southwestern and western Newfoundland which I know best. I submit to the gentleman from Fredericton that he will know communities where equivalent havoc is being created by the Canadian Jobs Strategy program because the question arises, if you live in Toronto and are working in the beer plant and the beer plant closes, you can go down and get on a training program through Canada Manpower. Then you can go down and get a job putting bolts on the car in the car plant in Toronto.

The problem with Ramea and Belleoram is there is not very many car plants there. To put it differently, what do you train those people for? They have residents in those communities that now have the skills. They have the logging skill, the fishing skill, the homemaker's skill, the carpenter's skill, the welding skill. They have together the aggregate of skills which are required to survive and thrive in those communities. So what do we train them for?

In effect, those programs are denying them training altogether because there is no training that is appropriate or in the other case we are training them to pack

Supply

suitcases to move to Toronto and Fort McMurray. Either of those options is unacceptable.

I say to the gentleman from Fredericton that it is absolutely unacceptable for people who have their roots there—I say to my friends from British Columbia, their loved ones and friends—to have a government whose only objective is to tear them away from everything they stand for, their old value system and everything just to get bread and butter. There ought to be a better way. There is a better way.

The better way is for the government, instead of using Canadian Jobs Strategy money in a way that is year after year or month after month diminishing the requirement for job strategy money because those people in those communities I am talking about cannot satisfy the requirements. But they do have the need. They have the need for jobs. They have the need for something to bridge them over so they can stay among their loved ones, so they can be, on a continuing basis, in the community which has values with which they identify.

I want to ask the gentleman from Fredericton if he would adjudicate the Canadian Jobs Strategy to be the unqualified success that is being portrayed by the minister of employment or is he, in fairness to his constituents, finding that some of his constituents, too, are having some difficulty making ends meet because of the way the rules have been botched in Canadian Job Strategy?

Mr. Bird: As I said in my remarks certainly the answer to the job strategy is not the plundering of the resource. I share the hon. member's concerns about the difficult perspective those in small fishing villages face. It is a very difficult question to create and to innovate and contemplate the kinds of adjustment and redeployment that will be necessary. At least the Canadian Jobs Strategy does address those kinds of problems. There is a process at work in this government.

I would like to ask the hon. member the question in reverse. As we have heard so often in this House criticism of this government for one thing after another, what does the hon. member suggest he would do given the state of the resource, given surely his agreement with the fact that plunder of the resource is not the answer. What would he do? How would he cope with the situation in those small fishing villages? What magic would he wrought that is better than is being done here? I would like to have that answer. It was his government and your fisheries minister in the late 1970s and early