

Private Members' Business

by which we are able to produce products with particularly highly technical specifications and particular specialized uses throughout the world economy.

To achieve that, we must have the skilled work force to be able to run the machines, to work on the shop floor, and to work in the office buildings throughout this country which give us the vast increases in productivity and human capital essential to a country if it is to survive successfully in the 21st century in the face of competition from many low wage countries that can increasingly and quite rightly compete with us in the traditional areas of activity in which we are engaged in our manufacturing sectors.

How do we succeed in building that emphasis on training for the future? I think that we have first to recognize that in this country the situation seems to be one in which the support for training programs is not increasing but rather decreasing. If we take the period from 1985 to 1991 and the Canada Jobs Strategy, for instance, the funds which were provided for training through CJS started with a total of \$1.4 billion allocated in 1985.

Less than \$1 billion of that, actually, is for training. Some of it is for other programs as well. That increased in 1986-87 and was increased in 1990. It was then decreased in 1991. As of 1991 the total amount available to CJS is \$1.4 billion, precisely the same amount as in 1985, despite the much greater cost of training in 1991 compared to 1985.

• (1410)

We have seen some increases take place through the unemployment insurance system, but really it is extremely difficult to see a sufficient increase in any way to offset the increased costs which exist for training programs and which are not being covered by increased expenditures.

I do not want to pretend that the way to solve these problems is simply to spend more money. That has been part of the problem of the past. It has often been the view of especially the Liberal Party when it was in government that simply increasing expenditure was somehow the way to solve the problem. I think that it does make the situation considerably more difficult when training functions are being squeezed for resources at a

time when we desperately need more training to be taking place in the country.

Nevertheless, the key things that we believe need to be done threefold. First, we think it is extremely important that large scale corporations in the country start to recognize that they have a responsibility to undertake training. What we find in my constituency, for instance, is that most of the training, most of the serious apprenticeship programs which exist throughout the Windsor and Essex county area, are undertaken by the medium and small scale firms. Once people are trained, the large scale companies will then steal these people away at much higher wages and manage to fulfil their need for skilled workers without ever having to put into place training programs designed to increase the pool of such skilled workers.

We suggested a number of different approaches to try to deal with this problem. We suggested, for instance, that it would make a good deal of sense to have a training levy for all companies over a certain size within our economy. It would be possible for any such company to use up the money which it would otherwise owe the government in that training levy by undertaking training programs itself. If it did so, it would not have to pay the training levy.

In fact, if it over-expended, if it spent more than the training levy amount, it would be possible for such companies to receive government support for their training programs coming from the payment of those training levies on the part of companies that do not undertake such training.

In other words, we have some kind of a redistribution process within the company sector that sees to it that companies that take their training responsibilities seriously receive incentives and support to do so. That is one thing that we should set in place.

A second thing that we should set in place is a recognition that effective training is going to have to be training on the job. In part a training levy approach would encourage that, but I think we also need to say to provincial governments throughout this country that we are prepared as a federal level of government to provide support to the provinces for training activities but those