ment of Canada. I think he is out of order. I would even ask him to apologize and to withdraw what he said.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A point of order was raised by the Hon. Member for Drummond as to the use of possible unparliamentary language by the Hon. Member. I will have a look at the "blues" and report back to the House. The Hon. Member has one minute to complete his speech.

Mr. Whittaker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is another area I would like to touch on briefly. Once again, during the election campaign and over the prior four years, the Government told us it would look after the women of Canada. What has been done? The Government has looked after women all right. It has made major cut-backs of $2 million in women's programs. Citizenship training has been cut back. Many of these things hit at women.

During the election campaign, I met with a group of immigrant women, and one of the things these women said that there was not enough services given to women immigrants so that they could become productive members of society. What did we get in the Budget? We got the Government once again attacking that.

I want to say to the Government that it had better review what it has done in this Budget and look at what we as Canadians need. It had better look at the management of the future and come to conclusions other than the ones reached in the Budget.

Mr. James: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the speech made by the Hon. Member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. I am very concerned about some of the things the Hon. Member has said. I suppose I am really concerned about his lack of interest in giving credit to the people of the tourism industry. He feels that they cannot promote their businesses on their own and that there should be all sorts of federal money going toward advertising the tourism business in British Columbia. Certainly the tourism business in Ontario has been doing a fine job. These free enterprisers and entrepreneurs have attracted people to their places of business and feel good about it. He feels there has to be all sorts of federal money going to it and that the federal Government has not done right by small business. He also suggested that we have not assisted small business.

• (1720)

The Hon. Member said that he worked in small business, but small business people have told us in the last four and a half years when visiting Parliament Hill that they would like to have the opportunity to be unfettered, not hemmed in, or told what to do by government. They would like to go their own way.

Also local communities have told us that individual communities like to have flexibility in their decision making with respect to how best to help small business develop in their own areas. That is being accomplished by the funds that are being directed toward the Communities Futures. The Government feels positive about this and has had a good record in this regard.

Certainly the change in UI funds can be redirected to creating jobs, most especially through the Communities Futures Program, an excellent program. Small business told those of us on the DRIE committee during 1984, 1985, 1986 and 1987 when they appeared before us that they needed that kind of flexibility. We listened to what they had to say. Perhaps the Member should go out and have a talk with the small business people.

I think it is a shame that the Member tends to confuse the issue in connection with the higher income pensioners paying back some of their Old Age Security. It certainly goes on above $50,000, which is certainly a credible amount of money to be made each year. I do not think that he should be confused. If one has $100,000 income in 1989, one will only be paying $700 of that money back. I think the record should be kept clear in that regard.

Earlier the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands tended to confuse the issue. I do not think it was intentional on the part of the Hon. Member for Kingston and The Islands or the Member from Okanagan, but I think the record should be made clear. It goes along with what the socialists seem to have been saying for some period of time, that high income people should be paying their fair share. In the situation faced by higher income people, along with having the universality of the program maintained, they will pay back to assist in this terrible deficit and long-term debt problem in Canada. The Member should take note of that and be careful that he speaks clearly, concisely, and accurately about such things.