

*Government Orders*

of the unemployment insurance fund, but it also decides that it is not going to put any more money on a regular basis into the fund out of general tax revenue.

It is hard to take the government seriously when it says it wants to do more for training but is going to put the burden on employers and employees and stop its regular contribution from its own resources. By the way, last year that contribution was \$2.8 billion. As a result of the cut-backs that are set out in this bill, 155,000 Canadians who would have qualified for unemployment insurance will not qualify at all or will lose all their benefits.

That is according to the Global Economic Study. I know that the government thinks that that is a tainted study. We do not. It was commissioned by the Liberal party and the Canadian Labour Congress. We feel it was carried out on a scientific basis.

If you look at any of the impact studies, even the government's own impact studies, they indicate that people who got unemployment insurance before will not get it and those who do will get less.

I gave the figures for those who will totally lose their claims. There will be 775,000 Canadians who will have their benefits reduced. One hundred and fifty-five thousand will totally lose their benefits and 775,000 will have their benefits reduced.

In addition, by cutting the benefits as a result of this bill the moneys that were available to the poorer regions of Canada and to the less well-off provinces will be reduced as well. For example, Newfoundland will lose \$83 million because of the cut-back in benefits to Newfoundlanders who are unemployed. Prince Edward Island will lose \$16 million; Nova Scotia, \$43 million; New Brunswick, \$65 million; Quebec, \$507 million; and British Columbia, \$175 million. The government, by its own admission, is reducing regular benefits to the unemployed in this country. The money that would have gone to an unemployed Canadian in Corner Brook, in Bathurst, New Brunswick, or in Chicoutimi will not be going into those areas as it is now.

The government says it is going to use those moneys for development and training, but that is on a discretionary basis. There is no assurance that that money will go back into New Brunswick, Newfoundland or Quebec to pay for job development and training. We asked the minister about this in committee and she said: "You can

rely on me. We will distribute this money for training in an equitable way."

Right now it is in the statute. If you are unemployed and you live in New Brunswick, the money goes to you in New Brunswick. You can use that money to pay for your groceries and help the community in which you live. Under this bill, taking out the \$1.5 billion and leaving it to the discretion of the minister, we do not know where that money will be spent. It could very well be spent in Toronto. I have nothing against Toronto but Toronto has a full employment economy. It could be used for high-tech training, for administrative training, and not in the areas where they really need money for development.

I put forward an amendment at the report stage of this bill to ensure that those moneys that were being taken away from regular benefits would go back to the same regions and provinces, but the amendment was turned down.

We have further objections to the provisions in this bill whereby unemployment insurance moneys will be used for training. In many cases, if you retrain workers in certain parts of Canada, there are no jobs for them to go to in those regions. When we were in Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island people said: "I am a fish plant worker. I cannot get work. You are going to retrain me, for what? You are not making any provision for new types of work or new types of employment in my community. So you are going to retrain me as a high-tech electronics tradesperson. What am I going to do in my community?" Many of those people believe that this is a bill to relocate them to Toronto, Calgary, Montreal or Vancouver, away from the communities where they have always lived. If you retrain people, they need a job to go to once they are retrained in that new area.

Others said to us: "I am unemployed. I am trained. I am a skilled plumber. I am a skilled electrician. I do not have work now. I want work. I do not want to be retrained. I spent five years in apprenticeship. I spent many years as a journeyman. I am skilled. I do not want to be retrained. I want work."

Again, people are objecting to using their unemployment insurance moneys to retrain them for jobs that do not exist or to retrain them when they are already trained as skilled workers. We all admit that there is a great need for training in certain areas of this country to improve our skilled workforce but, once again, it should