

Mr. Kindy: Some member is talking about stimulating the economy in the province of Ontario, if I hear him right. Naturally the economy in Ontario has suffered, mostly through the free trade agreement. This free trade agreement has been brought in by the Conservative government without enough studies. This is why right now we are not in a recession but in a depression.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member would certainly allow one-minute rebuttal from the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River.

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, the hon. member has quite fairly made reference to the remarks by the hon. member for Carleton—Charlotte.

He focused on good news. There is the odd piece of good news out there, but the fact is that the government pursued an economic policy over the last year or two of high interest rates in an attempt to bring inflation down. There was a free trade adjustment going on, plus a global restructuring in a number of areas industrially, and it has basically brought this economy to its knees. Part of that recession was government induced. The existence of a large government debt did not help and our economic circumstances are really not too good.

The hon. member was not misleading when he gave his facts, but he is certainly showing an awful lot of blue sky when Canadians are seeing it as otherwise. We are looking for reality and accuracy in these debates.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Two members were splitting a 20-minute period. We have just finished a five-minute period of questions and comments.

I will recognize for the second 10-minute period the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I am actually quite disturbed by the bill we are voting on tonight. We are talking about almost \$50 billion of taxpayers' money when we include the both packages we will be approving or voting on tonight. That is an awful lot of money to be making a decision on. The member for Scarborough—Rouge River made a very good point which was that we probably should have a much longer debate on this with much more ability to be specific about where this \$50 billion is going. I do not know if a \$1 billion expenditure could be put through this quickly in a board meeting of a major corporation. We are talking here of almost \$50 billion of taxpayers' money.

Supply

How do you address all of this appropriation in less than 10 minutes? It covers everything from the Department of Agriculture to Enterprise Cape Breton, the communications—

Mr. Boyer: Speak of something specific.

Mr. Mills: The member says: "Speak of something specific". The specific thing I want to refer to is the fact that the process of spending \$50 billion worth of taxpayers' money in one day is a little too quick. There should be a much longer debate on this with more specifics especially when people out there are having difficulty right now. They are saying: "When you are spending almost \$50 billion, isn't there some way you can find in that lump sum of \$50 billion a little bit more money for training?"

Right now in the city of Toronto people wanting to be retrained cannot find places to be retrained because we have apparently run out of money. It does not matter what part of the city it is. You can go to Centennial College, Seneca College, Humber College, George Brown College, there is no more training money left and here we are approving \$50 billion.

If we were addressing the most serious problem that is facing our economy today in a more direct and radical way, and I am talking about the fact that there is close to two million people unemployed out there right now, then I might feel a little bit more confident.

Mr. Boyer: The amount of money in this year's budget is bigger than last year's budget.

Mr. Mills: The member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore says that there is more money in this budget or in this appropriation for training than there was the last time.

An hon. member: Where is it?

Mr. Mills: It is still not enough. We heard the member from Carleton—Charlotte talk earlier about how well the economy is doing with the zero inflation rate and the low interest rates. The government has room to put a little bit more money into training. It has room to put money into some capital projects to get people back to work.

At what point do you loosen up? Canadian taxpayers, and we are all representing Canadian taxpayers here, are being asked to give the government \$50 billion. This is at the same time as there are low interest rates and low inflation. At the same time government has no money for retraining and people cannot find opportunities to be retrained. There seems to be a lack of confidence in the