

Government Orders

provinces are simply going to have less money to pass on in per capita grants to their municipalities.

I want to briefly touch on one other area and that is the whole issue of training. Training, retraining and job development is the responsibility of the federal government. It should not be placed on the backs of workers and employers. This government has, by sleight of hand, withdrawn from its responsibility and is simply saying: "Look, the unemployed are going to be deprived of benefits in order to finance retraining." That is no way in which to get a skilled workforce.

Fifteen per cent of the unemployment fund is going to go into job creation, moving costs, work sharing and even business start-up. This, of course, means that there are less funds available for what the unemployment insurance fund was designed for. We have to remember that Canada has an unemployment insurance program, an insurance program to protect workers against a period of unemployment. It is not a slush fund out of which the federal government may draw money for its schemes of job creation or its schemes of retraining.

The workers in Canada need not only retraining but a whole series of training programs. Instead, the federal government has cut back from \$2.2 billion in 1984 to \$1.5 billion in training. Now it is trying to find some method of making up for it by putting this responsibility on the employers and employees.

I see the Speaker is indicating that I am running out of time. In summary I want to say that this piece of legislation, in my opinion, flows directly out of the free trade deal. I am frightened that, unfortunately, this is not the last piece of legislation that we are going to see that erodes our social programs in order to harmonize us with the United States.

Mr. Gardiner: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member from Surrey North who always speaks so sincerely and passionately about issues in his riding and a number of the items that we have to debate here in Parliament, in particular this legislation which impacts on a lot of people, many of whom do not have a voice. The member has had some experience in government at the local level. I would be interested in hearing his comments on how we can make a difference on issues such as unemployment and unemployment insurance. What can members do in co-operation with local govern-

ment and business to ensure that we can give those people who need a voice the voice that that they so desperately need.

Mr. Karpoff: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, of course, in this type of legislation is trying to give a voice to the people who are going to be most adversely affected by it. There are a number of things that I have tried to do to see if I could reach out to the people in my riding and in some of the adjacent ridings because some of the adjacent ridings are represented by Conservative members who do everything they can to prevent the public from reaching out to them and telling them what the impact is of their legislation.

There are a number of organizations that I have talked with. I have talked to people on the local school boards and municipal councils who are desperately frightened by this legislation, particularly in Surrey. This fall in Surrey, because of the fast growth, we have 9,000 children in portable schools. They are having difficulty developing recreation centres and health centres because they do not have a municipal tax base. All of a sudden along comes the federal government which says that instead of developing a recreational centre for seniors, they are going to have to come up with \$814,000 in order to pay for the federal government's responsibility for unemployment insurance and job retraining. Sixty per cent of all housing starts in the lower mainland are in my municipality. They are behind in providing services for people.

• (1200)

How do we reach out to them? We have a group of unemployed people who are experiencing increased difficulty in finding employment. This bill does not state that if you do not qualify for UI, you do not qualify for the training. The very people who need the training the most, the ones who cannot get in 20 weeks of work or who have already exhausted their UI, do not qualify. So what good is the training?

We have to start a whole different concept of training, including being able to train people who are already employed. This is to provide them with greater skills because at the high end of the skill market we are always short of workers. What we have to be able to do is provide the backyard welder with the opportunity to upgrade and become a construction welder. Then we can take an unemployed person and train him to be a