

*S. O. 21*

regulations originally brought in by the Minister of Finance and the Conservative Government in November, 1984. I can underline that unfairness by talking about the impact it has had in my riding where many former service personnel have retired. It is important to remember that for most ratings in the Armed Forces early retirement is a requirement.

After 25 years in the services many members are required to retire. They are aged 45 to 50 and still have growing families. They still have heavy mortgage payments to make and must make provisions for their children's education. They still have a good part of their working lives ahead of them. The pensions they receive from the Canadian Armed Forces are not extravagant. They are very modest and they have a difficult time getting by on them. They need to have continuing employment but in that part of Canada there is high unemployment and it is very difficult for many of these early retirees to find employment.

When these regulations were brought in they formed a group called the UIC Repeal Group, 1986. It is made up not only of ex-service people but as well of early retirees from the Public Service and also of people on private sector pensions. This group is made up of working people who feel that they have been betrayed by the Government. They feel that the Government was elected on a promise of fairness and to create jobs. The jobs have not been created, particularly in my area, and instead of fairness they see discrimination pointed directly at them.

To give you a better idea I will read briefly from a couple of the letters I have received on this issue. A person living in Ganges, British Columbia, writes:

Perhaps you can better explain why I can't or won't receive unemployment insurance benefits after having been told by my former employer B.C. Hydro and my union, I.B.E.W. that I should apply for same.

In November 1986 I went to the U.I.C. office in Saanich and registered my application. In a few weeks I received two cards to complete and return on the appropriate dates which I did. Several weeks later I received a rather ambiguous letter—informing me of the weekly amount of my monthly pension but not denying me my claim, along with more cards to fill out. I have regularly been receiving and sending cards since.

Finally, sometime later, I phoned the office to try to determine exactly what if anything was happening with my claim and was told that I was not entitled to any benefits unless I returned to work for the required minimum number of weeks. This seems to me to be absolutely ludicrous and totally unacceptable. I served overseas with the RCAF during WW2 and understand my UI payments were made by the military. I've worked for over 38 years and have never made a claim. I've taken early retirement because I am unable to safely climb power poles anymore. (I was a Hydro lineman) my monthly pension is considered to be "earned income" and now I'm told all of that amounts to nothing, but if I return to work for 20 weeks I will be eligible for benefits. This surely has to be the ultimate insult.

The contradictory newspaper articles I've chanced across have done nothing but confuse me and in fact I fear I might find myself in a "no man's land" since my effective retirement date was 30 September 1986.

The correspondent is completely correct. He is in a no man's land, and that is exactly where this legislation leaves him. Perhaps I can call it one o'clock and resume my speech later.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne):** Order. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21**

[English]

**CANADIAN JOBS STRATEGY**
**CRITICISM OF PROGRAM**

**Mr. George Henderson (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, the Prince Edward Island Union of Public Sector Employees represents the employees of Holland College, the only community college on the Island. At their recent annual meeting the employees passed a resolution condemning the federal Government's Canadian Jobs Strategy Program.

They expressed a number of important concerns about the direction the Government has taken on job creation. The new emphasis on the private sector to provide skills training is not working in Atlantic Canada. The private sector cannot provide either adequate or comprehensive technical education.

In fact this backward job-creation program is hurting community colleges and depriving young Canadians of proper skills training. Holland College has already been forced to lay off some of its staff, and this trend is expected to continue.

Only the Government's incompetence is to blame for a job-creation strategy that results in lay-offs at those colleges where employment skills are supposed to be taught. I urge the Government to rethink its short-sighted attempts to privatize job training and put the funding back into community colleges where it belongs.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**
**SUPPORT FOR WHITE PAPER PROPOSALS**

**Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians love their country, and because we cherish who we are and the resources we possess, it is worth defending.

Members of our dedicated Armed Forces, and Canadians over-all, have waited 16 long years for a caring and responsive Government to reply to the genuine concerns about our nation's defence and military commitments to our allies. I commend the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty) on