

unless, of course, there is a complete disaster. The negotiated agreements with their unions indicate that. I think that is very important.

I would encourage labour in Canada to take a very long and hard look at that type of program because I am concerned that apprenticeship programs are on for a few months and then they are off. In these economic times, there is no question but that it is the apprentices who are being laid off first and are missing out on that much-needed education. So I appeal to the ministry, to the minister, to labour and to management to get together and take a long, hard look at our apprenticeship programs in this country and see whether we are doing the right thing. We should take a look at the modular educational process as opposed to the old process of four years of apprenticeship, because I think that maybe those days have gone.

Finally, as my colleague from Rosedale did, I want to congratulate a few people. It is always good for young people like us, rookies in the House, to watch an old pro at work, if I can use that terminology and it is not unparliamentary. As everyone in this House and many people in Canada know, for a great many years the hon. member for Brandon-Souris and his wife have diligently worked for those less fortunate than the rest of us. He was on the task force on the handicapped and he came to that committee with one purpose in mind—to ensure that those people with special needs were included in Bill C-115. Like a tenacious little terrier who has got hold of someone's pantleg, he would not let go until he had finished the deed. I want to congratulate him and thank him very much for teaching we rookies how to get the job done, an important job done.

To my colleagues, the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) and the hon. member for Rosedale, who served on the committee and also spent a great deal of time in the committee, I say thank you. To the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine (Mr. Bujold), and to the staff who were most co-operative with us, I also want to say thank you.

I think I had only one disappointment in the whole process. That was that those people who served on the task force really did not show up in the committee, with the exception of the chairman, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East, who just showed up for one of the meetings. I was disappointed that they were not there to help put forward the points that we were trying to make to encourage the minister to bring in the amendments and to produce a good bill. I know that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) will be following me. He was on the Employment Opportunities for the '80s committee. He did not show up, but he had some changed responsibilities and had good reason not to be there. That was a disappointment.

Now we face the challenge. Now we have the training bill in place. Now we must start training people. But, more importantly, we must train them for jobs which are available in the eighties. Right now those jobs are lacking, with one and a half million people unemployed. The Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) has disappointed us for two and a half years. I hope and pray that on Monday night he will come in with a

National Training Act

very positive, very upbeat, very inspirational type of budget which will get the economy back on its feet and give faith to the Canadian people who have lost their trust in the Canadian government, so they can be assured that when they invest, their investments will be good and so we can provide the jobs that are needed. Now that we have this training bill in place, I urge the minister to get on with the job of training.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the hon. member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid), I was spokesman for our party on questions of employment for a number of years. I served with hon. members from the other parties on the parliamentary task force which looked at the question of employment for the eighties. I was then assigned different responsibilities. Therefore, I was not really able to participate in the work of the standing committee which considered this bill, but I closely followed its work and its recommendations.

I want to say, as did my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper), who is now our spokesman on employment matters, that we will vote for this bill. We will do it despite the fact that we have some serious doubts about the government's programs or the ability of this bill to do a much better job than has been done in the past. I want to remind members of the committee that when the head of the Canadian Federation of Independent Businessmen was before the parliamentary task force, he referred to the present department of employment and its ability to do the job it is supposed to do. While I may not quote him exactly, I am certain that I will relate the spirit of what he had to say. As I remember, he said that if an employer is looking for a good, skilled employee to fill a vacancy in his plant, the last place he would go would be to the department of employment. I think that is a very serious indictment of the department.

Let me deal with what I consider to be some of the major difficulties, not only with the act but also with the government's approach to the problem of unemployment. It is pretty obvious to me that the major proposals contained in this bill were drafted some considerable time ago, a time when the depth and severity of the depression we are presently in was not expected by the government. I say "depression" in all seriousness because I think it is much more than a recession.

As usual, the government received incorrect and bad advice from its senior economic advisers. According to official statistics from Statistics Canada, we now have one and a quarter million unemployed. We all know that there are probably another 300,000 or 400,000 people who are also unemployed, but Statistics Canada only counts as unemployed those who are actively looking for work.

Today's *Financial Times* highlighted the severity of the problem with a front page story headlined "UIC rates set for huge rise". I will read into the record a couple of paragraphs indicating its predictions. It states:

Some private forecasters now believe that the total bill for unemployment insurance benefits in 1982 will be at least \$7 billion to \$8 billion, maybe higher if the unemployment rate continues to rise. This is a huge increase over the \$4.8