

Supply

I want to report, however, that there is not quite the same keenness and enthusiasm expressed by provincial officials, particularly in our western provinces where they tend to want to go it alone and, as a result, are substantially impeding the development of new training programs in these areas.

Where is the minister's justification for claiming that western provinces are impeding the progress of training?

Mr. Axworthy: As we have tried to point out in the House several times, the labour market in Canada is not divided along provincial or even regional lines. We must draw our skills, our people and our resources from right across the country and from outside Canada. In our forecast it is estimated that the skill shortage in the western provinces will be in the neighbourhood of almost 30,000 per year over the next four years. Those are people who are not available in those provinces or are not being trained at the present time. They will come from other provinces and other countries.

Under those circumstances it is very important to ensure when they arrive that they have proper training and that the training is allocated in accordance with demands in terms of the different industrial sectors, whether it is mining, oil and gas, or pipeline construction. Therefore, it is very important to have the ability to employ a national training scheme and to have those kinds of discussions so that, within the jurisdiction of the federal government, where we must be responsible for the movement and mobility of people across Canada, we have the ability to make decisions and choices to ensure a large movement of people to satisfy the shortages in these areas.

At the present time we spend in the province of Alberta, which "likes to go it alone", as they say, well over \$65 million of federal money on our programs to ensure training in those areas. Furthermore, it is very important when training is provided that it is not provided for only one group or category of the population. We as a federal government have tried to be an equal opportunity employer and trainer to ensure proper access for native groups, women and minority groups.

As I pointed out in a previous answer, there are certain provinces which are opposed to that approach and say so in their legislation. If we are to make effective and efficient use of people in the country, then we must ensure equal opportunities. Again that is why we feel there must be a national approach.

If the member would look at the context in which that statement was made, it was within the context that Canadians must supply the labour market needs of western Canada. Canadians would be moving into those areas, not just regional or provincial people. That is the difference in approach between this side of the House and that side of the House.

Mr. Hawkes: Again I direct the minister to his statement, as reported on page 5418 of *Hansard* for last Friday. He deliberately said that it is the western provinces which are impeding progress in training. I suggest that is a false statement; nothing which he has said in the last two minutes substantiates it.

Let me move to disadvantaged people. Has the minister made a comparison of the success of provincial manpower departments versus Canada Manpower centres in terms of

their ability to place disadvantaged people in this country, those who are disadvantaged because of age or physical handicaps, women and native people? Which agencies of government, provincial agencies or federal government ones, have the best record in the country today?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, I point out to the hon. member who seems to be here to defend the provincial governments, a role to which he is welcome, that in the very famous apprenticeship program in the province of Alberta, of which he is so proud, less than 1 per cent of the enrollees are women.

Mr. Hawkes: I suggest to the minister that that situation is true across the country, as we have discovered, and in fact in some places it is even less. If he looked at Government of Canada apprenticeable trades in some government departments, I do not think he would find anything about which to be proud.

● (1810)

There is a great deal of fear growing in Canada. The tone of the minister's speeches seems to imply that he intends to interfere with provincial jurisdiction in the area of education. I would like to ask him if he can clarify for us whether or not it is his intention, over time, to take unto the federal parliament responsibility for many educational endeavours which are in the laps of the provinces under the present constitution.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Chairman, we know how easily the hon. member opposite gets frightened. I do not think most Canadians share his well-developed sense of apprehension. I have never indicated I intend to take over the jurisdiction of education, nor does this government intend to do that. In many cases we have been quite concerned that the provincial governments have not lived up to some of their responsibilities. If the hon. member recalls, we had a discussion in this House on Friday concerning that very problem. In many cases we were being asked to provide opportunities to ensure there were basic skills. This was an area which properly fell within provincial jurisdiction but it was not being satisfied.

I would also like to point out to the hon. member that the area of training is one which is shared by levels of government and with industry itself. Many of the problems we face in getting people into areas where skill shortages exist begin in the primary and secondary schools where there is lack of counselling. We have worked in a very co-operative fashion with a number of provincial governments to overcome that problem. In my own province of Manitoba we have worked with the provincial government to establish resource centres and choice programs so that young people can receive the kind of counselling and career choices which they so desperately need.

We have absolutely no interest in developing major confrontations with the provinces, as long as they are prepared to co-operate with us. Co-operation is a two-way street. It must work in a joint fashion. But there are problems which arise because someone says, "We will take your money but we will not take any accountability for it; you just give us the money