

the icy, rough conditions of winter. He began to have brake failures. The heater did not work in his cab. He complained to his employer who said: "In the 1950s we never drove with heaters. Just put on some more clothes". So he did but the brakes did not get better. He began to find that the brakes were not adequate.

The rule of the road is that a driver of a truck that does not pass the road test, a spot test by the traffic board, is responsible for having that truck fixed before he moves it even if he is driving for someone else. He also must wait without pay until that truck is fixed. His employer expects him to have the load arrive at the destination so the driver is responsible for making that truck go. He is also responsible when he takes the vehicle out of the yard in the first place to make sure it is safe to be put on the road. When it was not he refused to drive it and the employer said: "You have quit and you are fired".

The employer gets to fill in the papers explaining the separation and he said: "This man quit". That man is now no longer eligible for unemployment insurance. The system does not permit the employee to file a reason for leaving the employment, only the employer's side is heard.

• (1805 )

Under the new rules this person would be without any unemployment insurance even though he had been driving for 10 years and had been contributing all of that time to the fund.

A second separation involved a two-man crew with one man as the boss, the other man as the worker. The person who was in charge of the crew, of the drilling rig and the seismic operation got very drunk and was having problems with drugs. They arrive late because the foreman did not get up on time. They found that the truck, which had been left running overnight at the drill site had run out of fuel.

To indicate his level of competence on this particular day, he began ripping off fuel lines, allegedly to drain the air out of the system. Instead of pulling off fuel lines, he pulled out transmission and brake lines. This is how adept he was at his job on that particular day.

### *Government Orders*

The other worker, who was going to have to handle dynamite with this man in a few minutes when they got the rig going, decide that he was not going to work with him on that day. The report shows that this man quit and he was denied unemployment insurance. There was no way that he could prove just cause because it was his word against the foreman's. Again there was no opportunity for the employee to provide his side of the story.

The rules are unbalanced now. The 7 to 12 weeks are a safety net for people to be kept off the welfare rolls. The changes in this bill will hasten the number of people going on welfare because they will be denied the unemployment benefits they have been paying into for all these years. The system does not permit a fair adjudication of the reasons for leaving their employment.

The government's regulations and instructions to the offices increase its image of hypocrisy among the users of unemployment insurance because of some strange things that go on with the literacy program.

The government says it is improving literacy and trying to train people to be able to read and write and go on to further training. Yet I have numerous examples in my riding of people in their early twenties who decide they probably should complete high school so they can go for further training. They are unable to get approval from the unemployment insurance system to take these upgrading courses.

They have access to a high school in their community. In order to go to a community college or a night course, they will have to drive 150 miles one way. So they enrol at the local high school to complete their grade 12 and are immediately cut off unemployment insurance. They no longer have any money to pay their rent or buy groceries so they have to quit school and go back to seeking employment.

It is a dead-end proposition. It is certainly no way to fight illiteracy if there are rules that do not encourage people to go back and get the kind of training they need.

For the balance of my time I want to turn to the proposed cut of 10 per cent to the Western Grain Transportation Act. This means \$72 million less to the railways which will come out of farmers' pockets next year. The year after it will be \$104 million. In my district, this means \$2.80 a tonne more that farmers will pay