

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

ance Act to determine the number of weeks UI benefits should be extended as unemployment increases.

It also defines the portion of the Unemployment Insurance Program which should be financed from general government revenues. It explicitly accepts that when unemployment is high the unemployed worker will have a longer job search and that the cost should be borne by government which should manage the economy such that the unemployment level not be greater than 4 per cent. In insurance parlance, it is a form of third party liability. It is a form which is about to be removed.

Much has been made about the extent of training under this program. I just want to say briefly that despite the strong consensus on the need for training—and I agree that training is needed—the Government training programs have been dismal failures. If we talk to anybody who has gone from a well paid job into a training program to being trained for jobs that do not exist or for low paid service industry jobs, they will tell you that first of all the wait is too long, that second the jobs are not there when they are done and, third, that they cannot live on the salary they earn in those jobs. Most Canadians, although they believe that the Government has a responsibility for training, are becoming very cynical. They do not trust that the Government is serious about filling the training gap.

The Government has not been satisfied with getting the so-called free trade deal through. The Government now launches an attack on the very workers whose jobs were lost by making huge cuts in the length of benefits workers are eligible to collect and increases in the time these workers must have worked to qualify for unemployment insurance.

The most offensive is that these same workers are forced, along with employers, to pay the increases in premium for the decreased benefit. Why? It is because the Government is getting out of the unemployment insurance business.

It is interesting that at the same time the Government is running around the United States, the corporate U.S., saying "Canada is open for business", it is running all over Canada saying "the Government of Canada is getting out of business".

Let us examine how Canada is going out of business. The Government is getting out of the UI business. The Government is getting out of the passenger rail business.

The Government is getting out of the airline business. The Government is getting out of the oil business. The Government is getting out of the post office business. The Government is going out of business in area after area, and now it is telling Canadian workers: "Tough beans".

In my community, rail workers have been laid off because of cut-backs. Airline workers have been laid off because of mergers from deregulation. Child care workers will be laid off because of lack of funding. Help care workers will be laid off because of lack of transfer payments.

I would like to go on to the forestry workers. The Minister of State for Forestry (Mr. Oberle) and the forestry workers in my riding and a number of other ridings in British Columbia are losing their jobs because of the abysmal record of this Government. It promised a full Ministry of Forestry, and we did not get it. It is not in the Budget.

There are hundreds and hundreds of jobs in my riding, including hundreds of forestry jobs. I would invite the Minister to join me in my riding, to visit those forestry workers, and to tell them the sky is falling.

It is a cruel joke. It is vicious and it is vindictive. However, most of all, it is a complete abandonment of a social contract entered into between the Government and the Canadian people.

There is impact on the municipalities, for example, as employers. The Hon. Member for Calgary Southwest referred to infrastructure. Let us talk about what the Government is forcing municipalities to do as employers. Taxes, that is what it is forcing them to do. What about small business and unemployed workers? For example, the Surrey municipality will face an extra expenditure of \$814,000 due to the increased UI premiums. This includes the municipality and the school board. In effect, the changes will result in a shift in the tax burden from federal to municipal government.

**An Hon. Member:** That is the Tory plan.

**Ms. Langan:** That is the Tory plan.

I would like to close my remarks by setting a scenario. Many of us have taken the opportunity in the House of Commons, those of us from the House of Commons, to go out on to the lawns of this great building and watch the light show. It is not the night show; it is the light show. I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if you