

account, CJS underspent by 20% of its allocation in 1985-86. (*Discussion Paper on The Canadian Jobs Strategy: Policy and Implementation*, Ontario Ministry of Skills Development 1987, hereafter referred to as Ontario Discussion Paper; Government of Quebec [Summaries]; Governments of New Brunswick [Hearings, May 15, 1987] and Saskatchewan, [Hearings, May 15, 1987]).

(88) During our hearings, witnesses said that the federal government has decreased funding because it gives low priority to helping Canadians train. (Government of Ontario, Hearings, May 11, 1987; George Brown College, Hearings, May 11, 1987; National Action Committee on the Status of Women [NAC], Hearings, May 17, 1987; Canadian Federation of Students [CFS], Hearings, April 27, 1987; Canadian Congress of Learning Opportunities for Women [CCLOW]; Hearings, April 27, 1987, among others).

(89) The method for purchasing training has also changed. Before CJS, the federal government purchased training from recognized private, public or nonprofit trainers, including private vocational or technical schools, community colleges and community-based organizations.

(90) Now, however, CJS makes it possible to purchase training through private intermediaries. Under the *Job Entry* and *Re-Entry* programs, such intermediaries are called "managing co-ordinators"; under *Job Development*, "project sponsors".

(91) These intermediaries are supposed to find people who need training and monitor their activities, a role previously carried out by Canada Employment Centres. Federal funds that would otherwise have gone to recognized providers of training (para. 88) are now diverted to these intermediaries — managing co-ordinators and project sponsors; consequently, less money is available to actually train people (Ontario Discussion Paper, p. 14).

### CJS Eligibility Restrictions

(92) The CJS claims to help people most in need (CJS Document, p. 3). However, witnesses told us that the CJS eligibility rules are unfair and counter-productive (Governments of Ontario, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan; CCLOW; CFS; NAC and others). In particular, the restrictions are widely felt by the recently unemployed, by women, the severely employment disadvantaged, older workers, individu-

als in threatened occupations and smaller communities, young people, Native Canadians and even workers who are still employed but need re-training.

(93) The CJS claims it focuses on assisting the long-term jobless rather than the recently unemployed. Witnesses told us repeatedly during our hearings (para. 92) they thought it unacceptable and illogical that the short-term unemployed must become long-term unemployed before qualifying for assistance under CJS. By being kept jobless longer than necessary, people who lose their jobs are subjected to severe economic and social costs that could have been avoided. Those who have recently lost their jobs would be better served if they were given tools with which they could quickly re-enter the workforce. Moreover, the more quickly they re-enter the workforce, the lower the cost to all levels of government (paras. 186 to 206).

### Women and the CJS

(94) The CJS identifies women as a group in need of special training measures; the *Re-Entry* stream of CJS claims to be designed specifically for women. The following groups told us that the CJS does not meet women's needs: the Canadian Congress of Learning Opportunities for Women (CCLOW), the Fédération des Femmes du Québec (Hearings, May 15, 1987), the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC), the Canadian Vocational Association (CVA), (Hearings, May 8, 1987), the Women's Employment and Training Coalition (Hearings, May 11, 1987). Only women who have been out of the labour force for three years can apply under *Re-Entry*. Initially, under *Job Development*, only those who had not worked for 24 weeks (six months) of the last 30 were eligible to participate.

(95) Women, married or single, with family and other responsibilities, often found it impossible to stay unemployed six months (under the *Job Development* program of CJS) or three years (under the *Re-Entry* program) before getting training to improve their skills. The result was that many were forced to stay in low-level, low-paid, part-time jobs. **Some improvements have been made in eligibility requirements, however (see para. 98).**

(96) Child care and travel allowances do not meet the real needs of women trying to acquire skills, (CVA, NAC). Allowances are granted on the basis of family status. The Fédération des Femmes du Québec