

everyone more selfish. When people become more selfish they turn on newcomers, whether it be a province, a city, or a country, and increase pressure on them to look after themselves because they cannot look after them.

This legislation has many side effects which are very negative. That is one of the reasons my Party is committed to fighting it to the bitter end and to proposing as many constructive changes as possible to the legislation. We think it is harmful not only to current workers but to the future workforce. The more we can do as a Parliament working together to create better legislation, the better off we will be. For example, the desire for parliamentarians to travel across the country to reach out to Canadians to discuss this more fully is a need that is not being met. The fact that some Canadians have had to get on a train themselves—one of the last trains in the country—to meet other Canadians to discuss this, is an example of how impoverished the attitude of the Government is toward the unemployed.

My succinct question to my colleague is the following: What impact does he imagine this will have on new Canadians?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Eglinton—Lawrence.

Mr. Volpe: I thank my colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Walker). It is a most insightful question, because it also included many of the impacts of the legislation before us today.

I want to point out to the Hon. Member and to the House that employers who are currently experiencing the greatest growth are those in the construction industry. Even in boom town areas of southern Ontario, those employers state that what they have proposed to the Government is legislation for training funds to be used for genuine employment opportunities. They see nothing in an area where there is a crying need, and that is in the apprenticeship training program. There is only an oblique reference, and that is it.

In answer to the other part of the question posed by my colleague, newer Canadians need the linguistic skills to be able to adapt the particular skills that they bring, together with their energy and desire to achieve, and put them into force in a productive fashion. In some areas of Toronto and in other major centres throughout the country, many of those people have to wait five or six

months before they can get into a program. How are those people going to be productive, not only toward Canadian society, but for their own personal well-being and the growth of their families if they are kept waiting for five to six months?

The only thing they can do is take up positions of labour that are obviously well below what we would classify as minimum wage. In fact, many of the jobs that newer Canadians and their children are forced to take are in the areas of minimum wage. One of the consequences in many downtown schools is that often the children of those Canadians are forced to supplement the family income by taking jobs which are initially part-time and turn out to be full-time and deprive them of an opportunity to continue their studies in school. Studies indicate that a very large portion of those who drop out of high schools in major centres are children of immigrants.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): On a question or comment the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Ms. Phinney: I would like to thank my colleague for a sensitive and clear explanation of this Bill. We know that there have been cuts in training indicated in the Bill. Could the Hon. Member give us an indication of where these cuts will take place?

Mr. Volpe: I thank my colleague for the question. It gives us an opportunity to highlight the deceptive nature of this Bill and the reason why it must be brought to the attention of all Canadians in order that they, as well as Members of the House, can address it with the vigour it requires. It has to be changed.

According to the Estimates presented for 1989 in job development, the area my colleague the Hon. Member for Bonaville—Trinity—Conception (Mr. Mifflin) referred to earlier, there will be a \$53 million cut. This is a Government states that its two-pronged labour development strategy will include a new training ethic. It is taking away \$53 million from job development programs where the long-term unemployed are given an opportunity to develop skills.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Walker), asks what happens to youth and to women who re-enter the market-place. There has been a \$50-million cut. Does this sound like a sincere approach to developing a training ethic? Does it sound like