

disadvantaged in our society will be even more disadvantaged, because there will be no standards whereby all of the provinces have to supply the minimum standard. Let us assume for a moment that there is going to be a standard to go along with employment training. The money in the fund would have to come from somewhere and that somewhere would have to be, in the circumstances we are in ourselves, the federal government.

• (1620)

There is no doubt in my mind, it does not matter how we slice it, that if we are really committed to increased productivity in the future, if we are really committed to getting this country out of the economic misfortune it is in, we have to employ a strategy which looks first at our work force, our most valuable resource which is the human resource.

We are now seeing in the actions of the government the abandonment of the statement made by the Prime Minister over and over again during the past four or five years. It is my hope that as this whole debate on the constitutional question evolves the government, as well as the provinces, will come to terms with the question of human resources. Not only the mobility of the work force between provinces is important. The retraining of the work force is far more important than its mobility.

That is one important point the government should look at very closely.

To answer the question asked by my hon. colleague there is a need for a policy. That policy must be matched with funds. Those funds have to go toward research and development and toward education. That is the only way we can get ourselves into the 21st century in good shape.

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Solicitor General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to my hon. friend. I know that he and his colleagues in the Liberal Party have worked very hard on their industrial strategy. They have been successful in keeping it under wraps for some seven years now. I wonder if my hon. friend would take this opportunity—it is a good time, a slow news day as a result of Question Period—to enlighten not only the government but probably the entire country on the Liberal strategy which has taken seven years to develop

### *Government Orders*

and has not yet been leaked out of the Liberal caucus, as so many other things have.

**Mr. Harb:** Madam Speaker, I am thrilled that the hon. minister has given me this opportunity to talk about the Liberal platform.

I want to talk about the past because my colleague has brought up what the Liberals have done. In the majority of the years we had a Liberal government, we had good times. Canadians did not go hungry. We have only to compare the record and look at the number of unfortunate events which have happened to Canadians over the past eight years and compare them to the previous eight years. Canadians could come to the conclusion fairly quickly that Tory times are bad times and Liberal times are good times.

If anything our government of the past had, and our government in the future will have, a full commitment to employment. One of the points articulated by Mr. Chrétien, the leader of our Party, over and over again is that at least with a Liberal government we will not be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

We will be introducing a policy taking into consideration the future of Canadians. We will be introducing policies to look after the interests of the people. We will be introducing policies to put this country into the 21st century in good shape. We will be addressing the questions of retraining, education, and full employment. We will certainly never allow a deterioration in the state of our social programs such as we are seeing now. We will never attack the underprivileged. We will never rob a single mother of her savings which help to carry her into the next month. We will never go after those who cannot defend themselves, and certainly we will not deal with the public servants the way this government has dealt. We will not attack the public servants. We will not attack over 55,000 public servants who make under \$27,000 without giving them a penny increase, with the exception of the \$500 the government proposed. Five hundred dollars was taken away from those people because if they had not been off the job many of them would have earned in excess of \$1,500. The government has not given them anything.

Certainly it is not vision to attack your public servants, your own employees.