

*The Budget—Mr. Baker*

turn that around. In a sense, that is one of the biggest obstacles that must be overcome. I think the figures for the first six months of the Canadian Jobs Strategy program will bear out that we are making progress in that area. However, we have a long way to go in the other areas. I am trying to tackle that and I welcome every bit of support I can get. This often relates to fields in which men have predominantly been given the opportunities, particularly the primary resource industries.

The second question was with regard to job entry and re-entry. These are two quite separate programs. One is for young people and the other is for women coming back into the labour force. I can assure the Hon. Member that we are assessing the Canadian Jobs Strategy as we proceed with it. It may be that those two programs should be separated even more than they are presently, with even more distinct criteria. I do not intend to change that until after the end of the fiscal year. Even now we are going through a reassessment to discover where the weaknesses of the new strategy are. This is not locked into place, carved in stone, or anything of that nature. We know that there will have to be adaptations. Again, I would appreciate suggestions from all Members as to how they think it can be improved.

With regard to the allowances, they have been increased in the last year. We have made it possible for people who are on part-time job creation or training programs to qualify for them. Therefore, we are making improvements. It is again a question of financial resources. We have increased both the training allowances and the dependent care payments, but I know that there is more to be done.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the Minister, but we have exceeded the time allotted for questions and comments. Is there unanimous consent to allow the Minister to conclude her answer?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Miss MacDonald:** I would just like to respond to the fourth point which the Hon. Member raised with regard to using private colleges as opposed to public colleges. This issue is now under discussion with the provinces as the time approaches for renewal of the National Training Act agreements which expire at the end of March of this year.

**Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to give the Minister a portion of my time to conclude her remarks because I was hoping to hear something in her remarks that I or other MPs would find useful, or that made some sense. The Minister and the Government claim that they create jobs. In and around in the evening *Telegram* in Newfoundland last week the provincial government claimed that it created 8,000 jobs in the past year. Now the federal Government is claiming that it created 6,000 jobs in Newfoundland in the past year. The only problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the unemployment rate has gone up. Canadians are asking where these jobs are that are being created. If all these jobs are being created, surely the number of unemployed

would go down. Our birth rate cannot be increasing that much. People cannot be returning to Newfoundland at the rate of 8,000 a year to take all the new jobs that the Government is creating. The Minister says 7,000 in Newfoundland. The Newfoundland Government is claiming credit for 8,000. That is 15,000 jobs.

● (1200)

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I suspect they are the same jobs.

**Mr. Baker:** No, no, I would not say that. I trust the word of the federal and provincial Governments. They have created 15,000 jobs. However, nobody knows where the jobs are.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** They are on paper.

**Mr. Baker:** I guess they are on paper. That is what is wrong with a lot of the remarks just made by the Minister. She reads things on paper and actually believes what she is reading. She says that her great employment program has done such wonderful things. They are training people for jobs which, in most areas of Canada, do not exist. I wonder if the Minister has actually looked at an application form for her Jobs Strategy Program. I am not talking about POWA, RTP, or these other things, I am talking about the job development program. That is where the majority of the funds go in her employment strategy, as she calls it.

When you look at that program, which I suppose replaced LIP and the Canada Works Programs, you do see a change. The sponsor now has to apply for a program in which he is to train people for jobs which need filling. However, what do you apply for if you are in Gander Bay, New World Island, Joe Batt's Arm or Virgin Arm, Newfoundland? You have had two phases of the water system put under ground by the job development program of the previous Government. Now you have to apply for a project under this program which trains people for jobs which exist but cannot be filled from the general workforce in the general area. How do you do that if you are digging ditches? You cannot. So all of those projects go by the wayside. How do you apply for a project to finish off your wharf if everyone in the community knows how to construct a wharf? How do you apply for a project to build a building if you have an excessive number of carpenters out of work? You cannot do it. So that the legacy of this Government in Newfoundland will be, as I am sure it will be in other areas of Canada, that we have two phases of a water system in place but never to be finished as long as this Government is in power. Obviously those people living in the areas concerned will want to get this Government out of office in order to get their water systems finished, construct their wharves or build community buildings.

The Minister should also look at the hiring criteria. In order to get a referral for one of her famed job development projects you must have been unemployed for 24 of the previous 30 weeks. Here we go again. We are going to have an affirmative action program here, there, and somewhere else, and in the process the majority of people are disqualified. You have to be unemployed for 24 of the previous 30 weeks. That means