

Mr. Dingwall: Oh, come on!

Mr. Fennell: On the other hand, it is not supporting education by increasing funding through the universities and colleges of this country. It is a disgrace to take \$370 million from education and put it into make-work projects. There is an Hon. Member from Newfoundland who will support this Bill. Excuse me, he is not from Newfoundland but from Cape Breton. It is one of the most beautiful parts of this country. But we need to assist those people in developing their brain power so they can create industries in that region. This is very important. I think if he and I were outside the House we would agree on this. The people of Cape Breton are so capable of learning they should be given the facilities to learn. They should not be suffering from cutbacks by the federal Government.

● (1210)

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I just want to observe after that answer that I have never heard such an eloquent reason for continuing support of geography lessons. It seems to me the Hon. Member would be well advised never to visit Cape Breton Island or he might learn the difference between Cape Breton Island and Newfoundland.

Mr. Fennell: Mr. Speaker, I do know the difference between Cape Breton Island and Newfoundland. They are both fine parts of this country. Admirable people live in both regions. They should be encouraged to take post-secondary education and thus create industries and jobs.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to hear the Hon. Member for Ontario (Mr. Fennell) spend a good deal of his time on productivity. In Canada today and in this House we spend a lot of time talking about almost everything except productivity. Productivity, as the Hon. Member said, is what will give Canadians better pensions and give our aged, crippled and retarded a better standard of living.

In my view, productivity depends on brawn and brains. Many people in Canada do not have an opportunity to get an education, but they add a tremendous amount to productivity through hard work, the strength of their backs and through the trade or the industry in which they work. We have tremendous resources in this land that will require development by the best of brains. We have vast supplies of coal in Cape Breton, in Alberta and in Saskatchewan. That coal should be used in Canada today to do away with the acid rain problem. Our coal is practically sulphur free. We need the technology developed by the brains of Canada in order to find ways and means to make that coal attractive to the industry in central Canada. That is just one simple illustration. We could thus save millions of dollars of destruction caused by acid rain and provide thousands of jobs. We require the improved technology that will come through primary, secondary high school and univer-

Established Programs Financing

sity education. I want to commend the Hon. Member for spending so much time on productivity.

In considering productivity, the Hon. Member mentioned the necessity for education. I am sure the Hon. Member did not mean in any way to leave out the other side, those who have not had the privilege of an education but who add to productivity. I agreed with the Hon. Member that we need to spend more money on education, not less. But we need to encourage those who have the brawn as well as the brains to increase our productivity.

Mr. Fennell: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned briefly in my speech my deep concern for what I referred to as the structurally unemployed. Those are the people with brawn who built this country. We will still require a large number of those people to man our industries. But by cutting back our education allowance, we cut back the opportunity for those people to upgrade their skills, perhaps on the plant floor.

Let me give an example. Instead of men slapping wheel discs on cars in General Motors, this work will be done by a robot. Men can be trained to operate the robot. Similarly, in the coal industry, much of the coal will be electronically mined as opposed to the old days when people used picks and shovels. Cutting back on education grants directly affects those people who are the most severely hurt in this new era which we are entering. I support the Hon. Member for Bow River wholeheartedly. We must look after those people during this process.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, one would have thought in reading the remarks made by the Minister on Friday, remarks which frankly I do not attribute to him personally because they are so fatuous and so ill-conceived that they have to be authored by someone else. They were authored in a vain attempt by this Government, as we have seen over the past year, to try to draw attention to itself, to milk every program of government as though it were its own. Possibly this is motivated by a certain philosophy in the Cabinet that says, in so far as Quebec is concerned, the Government has to get its credit because it will not get the credit from the Lévesque Government. That is right. But that is not so with regard to Canada.

I am not interested this morning in the quality of the established programs, medicare, hospital care and post-secondary education, as some of my colleagues have been. I want to point out to the Minister the first fatuous remark that was made in his statement, and here I refer to *Hansard* for January 27, 1984, at page 814, which reads:

Federal support for post-secondary education has brought significant benefit since this program began in 1967.

Who is the Minister trying to fool? When I came into this House in 1957 the program already existed. It did not exist with regard to the Province of Quebec because the then Premier of the province felt that contributions or assistance to