

golden horseshoe of southern Ontario around the great metropolis of Toronto, from which I come, 13.2 per cent actually quite their job without just cause. That tells us there is not much of a correlation between the government's decision to justify its cutbacks on the basis of a just cause theory.

In Saskatchewan, only 11.5 per cent quit their jobs without just cause. In wealthy B.C. it was 12.4 per cent. So, the poorer provinces find that their citizens work assiduously at whatever job is available.

• (1530)

Does Bill C-21 give them an opportunity to develop new jobs? The minister says that we are to develop new skills so that these people will be able to work and work productively. I say great. Where are these new skills to be applied? What is the economic strategy, the industrial policy, in which all these new skills will function and produce the kinds of benefits that the minister says will be there?

The minister cannot answer that question because she has not yet consulted with all those groups that appeared before the committee in order to give the committee an indication of what should be done. Even if we do give them some skills development, where will we apply them?

I say "even if" because quite frankly most of us in the committee began to look askance and with some scepticism that the minister and the department were intent on a new training system.

The minister is listening very carefully. In job development in 1988 the government actually reduced its input of moneys spent by 8 per cent. If we are to look for sincerity and direction in this particular bill, we have to take a look at its track record. In job entry programs there is a negative input of 1.7 per cent. The government said that we must train our people for the skills that are to come on line. I agreed with the government.

What did the government do? It cut back funds by 3.6 per cent.

What about skills investment? We need a futuristic attitude. We must look down the road. We must see where we can apply our talents and energies, our future. My leader said the other night, in paraphrasing Robert

Government Orders

Kennedy: "Give me your best for tomorrow; give me your best intellectual capacities and your best energies upon which we will build a new nation".

In skills investment the minister and her department last year diminished the amount by 7.05 per cent. The minister has been justifying many of these actions by saying the government will put in lots of money so that the communities at the local level can tell us what they need. Members of Parliament being from those local areas and being in constant touch with their electorate cannot tell it.

In Community Futures the government reduced its input by 2.5 per cent. In innovations there was a 20 per cent reduction. One must look with scepticism at all these projections that the minister says are on line because when we take a look at the final outcome there is a question of the constitutionality of this particular bill.

One presenter from the greater Toronto area pointed out that what was happening was that the government was asking for an increase of funds available for training of up to 15 per cent of the total UI budget to be applied to training. That is clearly beyond the parliamentary mandate of this government because the UI system is an income maintenance system, not a training system. Yet the government is going to take 15 per cent.

According to the 1989 Estimates—I am going to use the most conservative estimate of 15 per cent of well over \$10 billion excluding government contributions—that comes to approximately \$1.5 billion available for training. Coincidentally, in Canadian Jobs Strategy the over-all amount of moneys available is \$1.46 billion.

If we take a look at the track record of the government over the course of the last four years where there has been a reduction of \$770 million toward training, we can expect that the government will take moneys from premiums.

The minister said when she made her Freudian slip earlier on in the day: "We are going to tax the employed and employers in order to provide training for those who qualify". Quite frankly, we will see government input in the CJS program diminish by the same amount of money that is to be transferred from premium payments, payments that no longer reflect any government input. In