

*Government Orders*

of dependency and to partake in the building of a successful Canada in the next century.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question in view of the government's decision to withdraw the funds that it used to contribute to the unemployment insurance fund. This withdrawal of government funds necessarily would result in increased premiums both on the part of workers and employers. I would like to ask the hon. member for the government whether he can reassure the House that the government would not allow increased premiums to occur.

• (1230 )

Second, I would like to indicate that the Liberal party supports training and programs for the unemployed but would like the Government, if it is truly committed to the philosophy of training and programs for the unemployed, to fund these programs directly rather than take the funds out of the unemployment insurance benefits. We should get money by increasing efficiency in government, in response to another hon. member for the government trying to ask me a side question.

My question to the hon. member is whether he would lobby the government not to cut the unemployment insurance benefits but rather secure a separate source of funds for training and development for the unemployed.

**Mr. Kempling:** The premium rate in the bill is set for three years. Therefore there will be no change as far as the employee or the employer is concerned for three years. We will look at it after that and see where we are. The rates go up and down. Traditionally they are set yearly, but in this bill, with the consent of the commission, we have agreed to set them at a limit that will be established for three years.

As far as training is concerned there is a great deal of controversy over what we do about training. Members of the Opposition tend to say to us that we cannot use premiums that are paid into the unemployment insurance fund for training. That is not right. We have sought and received legal advice on this matter. Benefits under the unemployment insurance system need not only be money.

I think it is quite proper, if a person is unemployed and lacking in skills, that we provide training for him. There

is nothing in the law to say that we cannot remove some of those funds from the premiums that are being paid. We quite rightly have done that. We have said that the people who will receive training under the UI system will be those who contribute to the fund.

On the other hand, we have set up parallel funds under the Canadian Jobs Strategy to take care of people who have not paid premiums into the fund or who have been long-term unemployed. We think that it is a good effort. Every survey that we have seen across the country from small business, from labour groups, and from provincial authorities indicates to us that the workforce of the 1990s will have to be more skilled than it is right now.

Technology is changing. Capital investment in industry is increasing dramatically and will continue to increase as far as the projections are concerned. Therefore we think it is quite proper that we take this step and train people to be prepared for the work period ahead of us in the 1990s.

**Mr. Anawak:** I have a couple of questions or concerns with regard to the comments expressed by the hon. member. There is a tendency to talk about taking trips "across" the country. I wish people would take trips "around" the country so that they would include our area of the north, the Arctic. I would hope that other members will heed this in the future.

With regard to mobility rights or mobility in the UI bill, it states that we should probably move to other parts of this country. My concern is that we have been here for several thousands of years. We are not just ready to pick up and move anywhere just because the UI bill will now make us look for jobs elsewhere in the country.

I would like to assure the hon. member that with other parts of the country wanting to retain their distinctiveness we should also have the right to remain distinct in our part of the country.

**Mr. Kempling:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question raised by the hon. gentleman regarding going "around" the country instead of "across" the country.

I might advise you, Sir, that we did discuss this matter at our committee. In fact at one stage we intended to fly to the north. We talked about having a subcommittee go to the north. We did not have too many inquiries back