

tion in which we are going to have a lot of people under-trained, under-educated and under-skilled and we will become a country with a much smaller capacity to produce and to cut that deficit.

If you really want to cut the deficit, you invest in things which will make you more productive. To quote the president of the Canadian Federation of Students: "Students represent Canada's single most important investment in the future. Human resources are the source of our greatest productivity in this century and at this time. It is absolute nonsense to cut programs that will help people contribute to the economy of this country and that is what you are doing when you squelch on your youth, your education and your employment programs."

There is a lot that could be said in this debate. For example, apprentices, because they lack hope, are dropping out of apprenticeship programs. I have here a special article from Statistics Canada pointing out that over 40 per cent of the 50,000 participants in apprenticeship programs drop out because they feel they have no hope of getting a job when their apprenticeship program is over. That is just another example.

The government's policy in this matter is cock-eyed. It says it is committed to the training of youth, to the education of youth and to the employment of youth, but that is rhetoric. The facts speak for themselves. The government says one thing but it does another. I say to the government: "Wake up. You are ruining the country and the country's future. Change your policies now before it is too late. If you want to ask us what should be done, we will tell you to do more of what was done in the last four or five years and you would be doing something."

Mr. Garth Turner (Halton—Peel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment or two to the hon. member because he stood in his place and threw around a bunch of numbers about unemployment and also gave this House the distinct impression that the government has abandoned young Canada and is doing nothing.

I just want to remind the member that problems of youth unemployment are not new. As the member should well know, when he was part of the previous government and we can hearken back to the last reces-

sion, there was a youth unemployment rate of almost 18 per cent in 1982 in the month of May. In 1983 there was over 20 per cent unemployment among youth.

Now that compares with May of last year at around 12 per cent and May of this year at 16 per cent, which is still too high. I think we will all admit that, but the hon. member has an obligation to put this into a context that means something, instead of just giving us a lot of rhetoric.

On the issue of this government having abandoned youth, I think the member and the House need to be reminded, and the statement should be corrected by saying that in February of last year the government announced a program worth almost \$300 million just aimed specifically at this problem. That is not all. Summer Employment Experience Development Program is in place now for \$80 million; work orientation workshops, \$35 million; student business loans almost \$1 million; Canada Employment Centre for students almost \$10 million. This is serious money that is being spent.

I have one question for the member and it centres around one comment he made. He said there was a ridiculous argument that the government is cutting back on expenditures because we have a debt. I want to ask the member if he realizes that nothing hurts our youth more than debt. If we have cuts today it is because we had debts yesterday and the chickens are coming home to roost. We are poisoning the future and, what is most important, our youth knows it.

I would like to ask the member to rise in his place and tell us if he is going to accept and acknowledge his responsibility as a parliamentarian to stop squandering the future of this country.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for giving me that question. Of course we have to cut the debt, but you do not cut the debt by cutting back on education; you do not cut back the debt by cutting back on training; you do not cut back the debt by cutting research and development. If you are really interested in cutting the debt, you increase the productivity of the country. You increase the climate in which people will invest and they will find trained and skilled people in this country. The last thing you cut is education and pro-