

of whether too much is being left to be done by regulation. All of us appreciate the fact that manpower and unemployment are closely interrelated. I believe the minister himself will agree that there must be a close working relationship between the Unemployment Insurance Commission and those people who apply through the UIC for manpower training. This is necessary if we are to bring about any meaningful improvement to the over-all structure.

The responsibility for co-ordinating these two departments will probably rest with the present minister, who is answerable for the Unemployment Insurance Commission. This will give him an opportunity to consolidate unemployment insurance efforts with manpower upgrading. This was probably the reason behind the switch which was made not too long ago, in which the present Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Mackasey) retained responsibility for the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I am sure all of us appreciate the fact that when people do go to Unemployment Insurance Commission offices invariably they have to apply for manpower training. Invariably, they have to apply to obtain some information regarding the adult upgrading program. If they can do all this in one fell swoop, the effect can only be beneficial for the country and will result in a better co-ordinated program.

Further, Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that being trained is not the entire answer, particularly if the government is completely insensitive to the provision of job opportunities. The previous speaker mentioned this aspect of the matter. This is really where the government must be involved. It must be involved to the extent that there will be a program development associated with the type of job opportunities that are and should be available in Canada.

When speaking on this question I can refer to the "Eighth Annual Review of the Economic Council of Canada" which states:

Manpower policy is conceived of in Canada largely as a policy affecting the supply side of the labour market. In Sweden, however, "manpower policy" is far more comprehensive in scope in that it controls many expenditure programs affecting the level and location of employment and thus operates on the demand side of the market too.

Again dealing with the type of policy that is being used and the type of board that has been developed in Sweden, the review points out:

For example, the Swedish Labour Market Board (which includes government, employer, and union members, and operates autonomously as a statutory body) plays a prominent role in industrial location policy and administers an investment fund on the basis of contracyclical government policy.

If we are sincere in our talk about adult occupational training, we should determine that we must give some authority to the Department of Manpower and Immigration with respect to making the decisions as to where industries should locate in Canada. Does it make sense to have a department spend millions and millions of dollars trying to upgrade and retrain people if, after their retraining, those people have to be sent from one end of the country to another to fill job opportunities there? I suggest the government has a responsibility to involve this department in industry location decisions, because really manpower is the basis of the success of any country.

Adult Occupational Training Act

No doubt all of us have heard complaints about people who have taken manpower upgrading courses simply to have something to do. It is difficult for any manpower officer to question the intent of an individual who applies for an upgrading course, but it is true that people who have applied for such courses have told less than the truth to the manpower officer concerned. At the same time, there are many thousands of other people without employment who could benefit from such upgrading courses. This is one area on which we must express our concern.

A few moments ago, I mentioned the situation that pertains in Sweden, and now I turn to clause 6 of the bill with which one of my colleagues will be dealing at greater length. It specifically excludes people who are represented by recognized trade organizations and trade unions. Surely, it is a two way street. If workers are going to be employed by groups of employers, then the same principle should apply. Reference to this is found on page 3, after the third section. Possibly the minister will look at this very closely to see why the organizations themselves do not become involved in the type of discussion referred to on that page.

• (1420)

The Economic Council of Canada review contains the statement that manpower policy is largely a policy affecting the supply side of labour, and refers to the fact that we must spend some time in determining what we hope to achieve. Training on the job is an added benefit that the minister has included in the bill. I am sure it is something that he, his department and his deputy minister have studied. They will realize that we have poured millions of dollars into it, and more people should have benefited.

At page 104, dealing with manpower policy, there is this statement in the Economic Council of Canada's eighth annual review:

In striking contrast to several other countries, less than 5 per cent of total Canadian federal adult occupational training expenditures (excluding apprenticeship) is directed to training-in-industry. In the United States, about 80 per cent of federal training expenditures go to programs involving training and "work experience" in industry. In Britain, moreover, the Industrial Training Act of 1964 provides for a redistribution of funds among firms within a number of industries for training to be undertaken by industry itself.

The heavy—in fact, almost exclusive—emphasis on institutional training in Canada is difficult to understand when experts generally agree that, for many occupations and for many individuals, training-in-industry appears to be preferable.

The charts on the following page of the report show that of the total amount spent on training in Canada, only 3.9 per cent was for training in industry, while in the United States 76.8 per cent was spent in this area. The same thing applies to other countries like Sweden which spend a considerable amount of their resources on training-in-industry rather than the type of training we have provided. The occupational upgrading that is provided is invariably in a classroom setting, and once the individual leaves there everything he touches is foreign to him to the extent that many times he is not of much use to an employer. This is an area about which all of us are concerned as, no doubt, is the minister. I am sure he will be looking at the situation and, hopefully, will be trying to divert more