

shots in the unemployment insurance program. Yet the deputy minister continues to be the commissioner of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. They still want to call the shots with somebody else's money because now it is only employers' and employees money in the pot.

What they have also done is to use the money in the social insurance program for things which are rightfully the responsibility of government, such as the so-called retraining programs. They are taking \$1 billion out of the fund for retraining.

I have here a planning and environment assessment document entitled "Trends and Perspectives". It was put out August, 1988, by the Employment and Immigration Department. It lists the growth occupations. I want to quote from this document because these are the studies, and surely the department ought to take a look at the trends in growth occupations. They are outlined.

Here are the top 10 occupations contributing most to employment growth from 1986 to 1995. I will read them, starting with the first and most popular in the top 10: Sales persons; second, food serving occupations; third, bookkeepers; fourth, secretaries and stenographers; fifth, chefs and cooks; sixth, cashiers and tellers; seventh, janitors and cleaners; eighth, truck drivers; ninth, sales management occupations; and, tenth, barbers and hairdressers. These are the top 10 on the hit parade. This is a department's document looking ahead. These are the trends.

The script that goes with the document states: "By and large, low to medium-skill levels characterize these occupations, with most requiring little or no post-secondary education or training. The nature of these jobs could, however, change appreciably in the future with a higher proportion of 'mental' rather than 'manual' work being required. Virtually all the occupations listed opposite will require certain minimum standards of numeracy and literacy".

Then it talks about the quality of these new jobs. Here is the quality. It states: "While debate continues on this issue, it is worth noting that over 70 per cent of the new jobs, both full-time and part-time, created in Canada between 1983 and 1986 paid less than \$20,000 annually, with over 30 per cent paying less than \$10,000."

Supply

There is the trend. They are taking this money out of the unemployment insurance program to do what training? I just described what the top 10 jobs in this country will be up until 1995, and yet we are taking the money out of these jobs to train.

I heard the parliamentary secretary talk about how we need these machinists and all the rest. Madam Speaker, you do not send someone for a six-week course to become a machinist. It is all part of an apprenticeship program. In East Germany, West Germany, or European countries, it is an integrated program at polytechnical schools where people are trained for these particular trades. It does not happen overnight in six-week programs.

Why is the government doing this? Because now what we have is a system whereby the unemployment insurance fund will be used by the government for things that are rightfully its responsibility; relocating workers, labour adjustment programs, retraining programs and upgrading programs. All of that is coming out of the unemployment program. We do not have the money inside the program to improve the social insurance programs, for example, the kind of program we need for parental leave or the kind of program to enhance the benefits that claimants should get.

We know that the unemployment insurance program is not used. All the evidence points to the fact that it is not used by workers to just collect benefits. Take fishermen, for example, people in these kinds of seasonal employment. The government decides when you fish, how long you fish, where you fish and how much fish you can catch. These are not decisions made by fishermen. If you are going to determine all those things, you have to make sure you have a network of unemployment benefits so that people can live and keep their families with dignity. On the bottom line, that is what we are talking about. Are the unemployed in this country to be made welfare seekers, or are we going to provide the benefits so that they can live with some dignity and maintain their families in dignity in the community? That is what it is all about.

I want to conclude by saying that all of this chopping away and eating away at the program did not start with the Conservatives. I want to make that crystal clear. It began with the Liberals, the first neo-conservatives to