

Private Members' Business

training activities, undertaken for instance through various community colleges, must involve a very serious element of on the job training.

In the case of community colleges in Ontario, I would hope very much that a co-operative arrangement could be worked out through the new Ontario government and the federal government so that more money would be provided for training and that those community colleges and the training programs supported by the provincial and federal governments would commit themselves to see to it that at least half the period of the training program was spent on the job. That would give people graduating from those programs a sense of experience and, frankly, it would give them considerably better training.

Finally, I think that it is also useful to put into effect regulations through the federal and provincial training programs which I hope will become increasingly important in the future. Companies that benefit from having people working on the job or are supported through a training levy system should make a commitment to the people who are trained with what is in effect such federal-provincial government support. Such companies should see to it that the people involved would have a preferential chance at jobs within those companies.

That is what this particular motion which I have moved today sets out as a philosophy. Employers who benefit from federally funded training programs should see to it that long-term training is something which also leads to employment within those companies.

I think if that happens, if we start to take training seriously in this country, five years from now we should not have to look at such grim unemployment statistics as those which have been released today by Statistics Canada.

Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the matter before us poses a new meaning to the phrase job training.

• (1420)

Job training normally means acquiring the skills to do a particular kind of work. But the hon. member's motion asks us in effect to guarantee every job trainee a job. If the federal government's training program did not lead to jobs we might indeed be forced to consider this or

some other similarly radical proposal to overhaul our strategy; but long-term employment is the essence of our training programs. By far the great majority of our training projects lead directly to full employment lasting a year or more for most participants.

If a training project fails to meet its objective, if the trainees who participated end up having difficulty finding a job that meets our standards; in other words they cannot find jobs that are full-time, satisfying and well-paying, then we cease funding that project. It is that straightforward and simple.

As for the suggestion that participating employers be forcefully required to hire job trainees, surely the hon. member is not seriously implying that the government scrap its newly created approach to job training based on consultation and co-operation, and not compulsion. We all know that if an employee takes training he cannot be compelled to stay where he works. He may, for various reasons, not want to stay there. I am referring to the creation of the 22-member Canadian Job Labour Force Development Board announced by the Minister of Employment and Immigration just recently.

But let me return to the motion for the moment. If you decide to compel employers to do something, it is because you have tried everything without success; so you simply require them to do it, you do not consult with them. In other words, you demand compliance only after consultation and negotiation have totally failed.

But our new approach to job training has only just started. The Canadian Labour Force Development Board has only just been created. And, as the hon. member's alma mater, the *Toronto Star*, phrased it in its lead editorial on January 16, "The new federal approach is truly an attempt to co-ordinate our training programs and solve problems from the bottom up instead of the top down".

Mr. Boudria: Great newspaper.

Mr. Kempling: Surely with the promise of grassroots consultation ahead of us we should be giving this new venture a chance instead of marching in with a top-down requirement like the one urged in his motion.

Furthermore, the motion seems to cast government and employers as labour-market combatants. But, in fact, Canada has many economic players: business, labour, government, social action groups, educators, as