Government Orders

ment insurance system's entrance criteria should also reduce work disincentives.

By 1994, the government intends to attract additional investment of $1.5 billion annually in training. It expects to reach that goal through private sector training and skills upgrading programs.

The labour force development strategy will be a catalyst for economic activity. An expanded community futures program and increased support for entrepreneurs and the Canadian job strategy are all factors that will help increase employment opportunities.

● (1640)

Of the $1.3 billion that will be reallocated, $500 million will be used to enhance unemployment insurance coverage for new parents and workers over 65, while $775 million will be spent on skills upgrading.

Mr. Speaker, the government has allocated $100 million to support training for newcomers to the labour force. These resources should help provide training for between 40,000 and 50,000 new arrivals on the labour market. Employers, especially small businesses, will be able to use this opportunity to meet their employment needs. Nearly 25 per cent of our businesses offer structured training. The private sector spends about $1.4 billion on this type of training. A recent survey by Statistics Canada revealed that 14 per cent of Canadian manufacturers were experiencing production problems because of a lack of skilled workers. The Canadian Manufacturers Association indicates that 36 per cent of its members are faced with a shortage of skilled labour, while the Canadian Federation of Independent Business has pointed out that 43 per cent of its members are unable to hire workers with the requisite skills.

In Canada, unemployment insurance benefits as a percentage of our gross domestic product are about 285 per cent of what they are in the United States. On the other hand, they are about 70 per cent below the level of spending on that item in Belgium. Since the scope of the Canadian system comes closer to that of the Belgian system, would it not be more accurate to say that we are harmonizing our unemployment system with the Belgian system, which is more generous?

As for harmonizing our system with the unemployment insurance system in the United States, that is out of the question, because the system would be far less generous and its overall impact would remain the same after the reform. Canada's unemployment insurance system is and will continue to be vastly superior to that of the United States. The changes proposed as part of the labour force development strategy constitute a policy that is made in Canada. It considers aspects that are typical of our country, including the seasonal nature of employment in certain regions.

Canada's unemployment insurance system is much broader and more comprehensive than the American system. The Canadian system provides income protection during maternity and sick leave. That is not the case under the American system. The Canadian system provides income protection for seasonal workers, which is not the case in the United States. The benefit period provided under the Canadian system is much longer than that provided in any American state.

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, weekly benefits are higher in Canada than in the United States: 60 per cent of previous remuneration in Canada, as compared to 50 per cent in the United States. Extended benefits based on the regional unemployment rate are much higher in Canada than in the United States.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member's time has now expired. It being 4.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) on Tuesday, October 24, 1989, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the bill.

The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.