

*Supply*

ical sense but productive as well in the ability to harness entrepreneurial energies to the challenges of tomorrow.

I cannot sit by and allow the Hon. Member in his remarks to stress and outline a series of initiatives that represent to Members on this side of the House a retrograde step in terms of how we will prepare some very skills specific individuals for the coming decade.

I wish to finish off my commentary by asking the Hon. Member how he can justify reading through a list that suggests that the Government is preparing a new training ethic for the country when what we see in fact through the Estimates is a diminution of funds available in job development for those people who need skills preparation most, for those people who find it most difficult to enter the job market and for those people who the Government has been failing at both the formation and the instruction stage.

**Mr. Kempling:** Madam Speaker, I do not know what planet the hon. gentleman lives on. He certainly does not seem to be in the real world.

The job of retraining workers in the labour force today and retraining those who will enter it in the years ahead is a joint problem among Government, labour and industry. If one were to go through the industrial countries with whom we compete, one would find that industry has large sums of money dedicated to training workers. I was recently in Washington listening to an industry group which told me that it had dedicated \$200 million to upgrade the qualifications of the people in that labour group in order to maintain a competitive position in the world market.

I recently read summaries concerning the following industries in Canada: electrical, steel, automotive, textile and chemical. The summaries dealt with how much these industries were prepared to spend on labour training and upgrading the skills of their employees. It is millions of dollars. It is a joint job with respect to which labour, Government and industry will have to put their brains and thoughts together. That is what the six communities that have been set up to look into the six major areas that I outlined in my remarks have set out to do. It is how we

are going to go about this and what the requirements will be for the various divisions in our industry.

We have much work to do. I do not think that it will be an easy job at all. We certainly need the co-operation and support of everyone. If we are going to continue to nit-pick it apart and raise hypothetical situations such as the Hon. Member has done, then we are not going to make very much progress.

I know that the Minister and the Government are dedicated to this program. We will see that it goes through.

**Mr. Mifflin:** Madam Speaker, first, I would like to make a comment to put in perspective some of the specifics mentioned by the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling). He talked about the job development strategy. Indeed, we had a very good discussion on that topic last week. We did not always agree but I think our figures were pretty much the same.

The Hon. Member talked about job development strategy. I note that this year in looking at the Estimates the Government is putting in \$53 million less in job development strategy than it did last year and, indeed, \$50 million less in the job re-entry program.

I would like to make the point that in a more macro sense I do not think there is any question that the Canadian education system is on the ropes. In continuing to provide university education at least to an ever increasing number of Canadians, the central problem in the last 25 years has been the juxtaposition and to a certain extent the tension between trying to provide quality and accessibility.

In fact, to take it a step further, I think we have a triangle. On one side we have quality and on the other we have accessibility. At the bottom of the triangle there is money. I think we are looking at somewhere in the vicinity of \$7 billion. If that \$7 billion—or the money that is required to support the other two sides of the triangle—is not there, then the other sides will cave in.

The amount of money that is spent per student in Canada, as I understand it, has declined considerably to the point that, as mentioned by my hon. friend a few minutes ago, we are behind 14 other members of the OECD countries. Indeed, the operating grants in Cana-