

*Supply*

Winnipeg. I gave them a list of detailed questions that I would like answered so we could really see what was going on. I was promised answers, Mr. Speaker, but of course I did not get them. I asked for a list of all the job entry projects, for the names of all the training co-ordinators for each project, both individuals and companies. I asked for the number of trainees and occupational areas covered by each project and for the extent to which each project relies on an existing source of training to accomplish the delivery. I asked for the process of approval used for each project, including who approved them and what Government Departments, federal, provincial, or municipal, were represented when the proposals were approved. I asked what the process was for evaluation to see whether there would be jobs after the project finished. I also asked for itemized costs for each project. I could not get that information.

● (1710)

Let us look at a couple of the private sector projects which were approved. Jorge Management got \$158,000 to train 25 people for the retail sector over 36 weeks. Twenty of those people now work at The Bay. Surely the Government and the people of Canada do not have to subsidize Roy Thomson. Surely The Bay can manage on its own. The Bay made no commitment that there would be permanent jobs for these people. There is a revolution going on in the retail sector with more and more part-time people being hired and fewer and fewer full-time people working. That \$158,000 did not cover the training allowances. As far as I can tell, it went to the promoter for setting up the job.

The Principal Group is receiving \$128,000 to train 20 people over 20 weeks for the hospitality sector. These would be housekeepers, bartenders, maintenance, and front office workers. Do we know whether there will be jobs for these people when they finish? Will the jobs be at adequate wages or the minimum wage? Does the industry not provide its own training in these jobs, particularly in association with schools and community colleges? Of course it does. In short, why should we fund those types of projects and cut back on community projects? These are valid questions which have been raised by me and people in the dozens of organizations in the core area in Winnipeg.

The Fair Action for Community Employment group in Winnipeg has asked a number of related questions regarding Challenge '86 and the Jobs Strategy Programs. They have made seven demands of the Government in terms of the two programs, and they deserve answers. I want to put their requests on the record. They demand a complete list of those who applied and those who received approval for funding in the year ending March 31, 1986. They want to know what amount these approved programs received. They ask that all future applications for funding be reviewed and assessed on individual merit, rather than being grouped together. They ask for the re-establishment of the Ministerial Advisory Committee comprised of community and government representatives to be formulated to review, assess and approve all future

applications. They ask that 75 per cent of the total allocations under the Canada Jobs Strategy be designated for non-profit organizations to employ the disadvantaged, native, youth and women. They ask that the \$1.5 million that was cut from the Challenge '86 budget for Manitoba youth be reinstated. They want to know how Challenge '86 is going to address the increased student unemployment when Manitoba youth will receive \$1.5 million less than last year.

Members of the House can readily see that these community agencies are very angry with the way in which these programs are working. There is profound doubt that these programs are functioning to help those who need help the most. That is why our Party has proposed the motion under consideration today and why we condemn the Government for the way it has been handling the problem of youth unemployment. As was pointed out on *The Journal* last night, to which the Minister referred, we still have 16.8 per cent unemployment among young people. That figure is unacceptable to me and should be unacceptable to any Government in the country at this time.

● (1720)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Questions or comments, debate. The Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart).

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, before I start my speech, could you ask the Hon. Member for Madawaska—Victoria (Mr. Valcourt) whether he wouldn't mind barking outside? This is supposed to be a place for civilized people. And the same goes for our Small Business Minister over there. Now that is cleared up . . . This is for grown ups. Let the kids play outside so we can get on with our business.

Mr. Speaker, I think the motion moved by the Member of the New Democratic Party is correct in saying that the House condemns this Conservative Government for its management of the Challenge 86 project for young people. First of all, I must say quite frankly that when I asked the Minister, who unfortunately has cleared out, and that was a wise decision, Mr. Speaker, because she would be ashamed—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member is an experienced parliamentarian and knows perfectly well that one does not refer to a Member's absence. The Hon. Member may proceed.

**Mr. Malépart:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer just now was not true! In my own riding, I am ready to back the word of the project officer in whom I have a lot more confidence than the Minister, against what the Minister said, namely that 40 per cent of the funding allocated in the riding of Montreal—Sainte-Marie and all other Montreal ridings was reserved for the private sector, and that if the Member did not want a given company or business to participate, the funds were to be allocated to other private sector businesses, which is the first false statement!