

Supply

These jobs are nowhere to be seen in Canada, let alone in Quebec. Unemployment is running as high as 10 per cent in Canada. What the minister is suggesting today does not reflect reality.

He also said that the federal government plans to withdraw from occupational training, but at the same time, it is putting forward unemployment action measures to try to interfere, once again, in areas of provincial jurisdiction, because education and occupational training come under provincial jurisdiction.

• (1525)

I must say that I agree with the resolution passed by the Quebec National Assembly saying that the Government of Quebec is prepared to undertake negotiations with the federal government, provided that the federal government completely withdraw from occupational training.

Does the minister agree with the federal government's complete withdrawal from the area of occupational training?

Mr. Massé: Mr. Speaker, the first question or comment made by the hon. member, to the effect that there has been no job creation, is just not factual.

The fact of the matter is that, since we took office, 509,000 new jobs were created in Canada. I am quoting Statistics Canada figures. More than 119,000 new jobs were created in Quebec. That is my answer to the first question.

When we look at the facts, we can see that jobs, in fact more than half a million new jobs, have been created in the economy. Our economic and job creation policies work.

Second, regarding occupational training, we must make a distinction between two things. Quebec claims jurisdiction in the matter because education is a provincial jurisdiction. This means that we must withdraw from all training courses coming under their jurisdiction. But there is another jurisdiction involved which is a federal jurisdiction and, in fact, an exclusive federal jurisdiction, and that is unemployment insurance.

When we draw money from the UI fund to reduce unemployment, we are acting like any responsible person would in spending adequately the funds allocated to them; that is our jurisdiction. We are trying to limit future UI expenditures and to stimulate employment.

A measure designed, for example, to supplement a person's income to allow this person to find a job or to subsidize his company so that he can have a job clearly does not pertain to training. It is an employment measure coming fully under federal jurisdiction and involving the UI fund, over which the federal government has exclusive responsibility.

[English]

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member who spoke about the great amount of jobs that had been created since the Liberal government took over. I beg to differ with him. If jobs have been created, it certainly has not been as a result of the federal government. Any jobs that have been created have been done through the private sector.

When will the government realize that governments do not create jobs? The best thing that governments have been able to create over the last many years is debt. If job creation programs instigated by parliaments were successful, everybody in Canada would have at least two jobs.

The other day I asked the Minister of Human Resources Development about changes in the delivery of the training programs. He said that we really should be transferring resources to the people, to the private sector and to communities. I would certainly like to see that. I applaud the minister for even thinking about transferring training to the private sector. That is a great leap in attitude for the Liberal government. I would like to see that come about.

In the private sector at least the training would be job specific. It would be specific to the marketplace. The marketplace would have some say in what sort of training should take place rather than having training programs that are supported for example under section 25 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, whereby moneys are allocated to very questionable job training prospects. When I ask about those specific projects that take place in our area, because I would like to have some feedback as to what kinds of permanent jobs have been created and how many people have become employed as a result of those projects, I get very little response. As a matter of fact, I am waiting to get some information as to how successful or unsuccessful those programs are.

• (1530)

I believe the Bloc has come up with a good motion. However, I do not believe it is specific to Quebec. We are talking about Canada. Of course the Bloc oftentimes only speaks about the province of Quebec. This is certainly relevant in my province of Alberta, as it is in la belle province. The Bloc would have had our support if the motion had not been strictly specific to Quebec.

The auditor general questioned the effectiveness of this program. This is not simply an idea the Reform Party has come up with or the Bloc has come up with. The auditor general stated in his report: "In studying programs that pumped about \$4 billion into regional development over eight years, administrators often just added up the number of jobs the projects they funded were supposed to create and concluded that the programs had created those jobs". That is hardly the way to assess the effectiveness of the program. There should be more accountability with respect to these programs.