

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, November 2, consideration of the motion of the Mrs. MacDougall that Bill C-21, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act, be read a third time and passed, and the amendment of Mr. Volpe (p. 5480).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

The last speaker was from the Liberal Party. Therefore, I must recognize a speaker from the NDP and the hon. member for Surrey North has the floor.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I think there is an understanding in the House that the New Democratic Party will get two 10-minute speeches and then we will allow the Liberal spokesman a 20-minute speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is that also agreed?

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but say we agree. I would prefer that the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce be heard first because he has a doctor's appointment and he just told me that he would prefer to get away before twelve o'clock to attend that appointment. It will not affect the rotation.

**Mr. Murphy:** We are certainly willing to fit in the doctor's appointment, as long as it is understood that we do not lose our place in the rotation and that we would get a third speaker before the vote comes this evening.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** We will see what we can do about it. How can the Chair project at this time whether the last speaker will be from the NDP or from the Liberal party?

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, we are working on the basis of unanimous consent right now. I think there is an understanding among the three parties that we will get a third speaker before the vote at 4.45 p.m.

### Government Orders

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, we will make sure that the NDP get an additional speaker. I thank them for their co-operation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I thank all members for their co-operation.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the members of the New Democratic Party for their co-operation. I apologize for having to make the request that I did.

Once again, we are debating Bill C-21, a bill which savagely cuts back on our unemployment insurance system. This bill, and this is according to the government's own estimates, will reduce or cut back unemployment insurance benefits by approximately \$1.5 billion, and those moneys will be redirected to employment development and training.

Government members and the minister justified this bill on those grounds. They say that employment development and training are absolutely essential and consequently we must put more money into that particular area. We in the Liberal party totally agree that more money should be spent on employment development and training. However, we are totally opposed to paying for that employment development and training with unemployment insurance moneys.

The unemployment insurance fund and the unemployment insurance system were set up in 1940 following the Great Depression to provide moneys to people who were unemployed against their will so that they could take care of themselves when they were unemployed. The moneys in the unemployment insurance fund are meant to provide unemployed Canadians with enough money to pay for their rent, to buy their groceries, to send their children to school; to pay for the essential necessities of life. That is the purpose of the fund and that is the purpose of the system. It is totally wrong to take money from that fund, moneys that are to be used for that purpose, and spend those moneys on employment development and training, no matter how important those things are.

It is interesting to note that this same government reduced the the budgets for employment development and training by 32 per cent since 1984. When they came to office in 1984, the budget for employment development and training was \$2.2 billion. Last year, that was reduced to \$1.5 billion, a reduction of \$700 million over a four and a half year period.