

*National Training Act*

That is why I would not want to give a veto to any one of those segments and say that we are the only body in the country, as a national government, that can represent a national point of view.

The minister changed his mind some time between Tuesday and Thursday. To his credit, on Thursday he accepted a number of amendments that did allow vetos for provincial governments on certain aspects of the bill.

The hon. Dr. Bette Stephenson, who represented nine provinces, the territories and the Yukon, made a very strong plea for co-operative federalism. I believe that her presentation and her ideas probably exemplify what we on this side of the House would like to see happen to federal-provincial relations. Consultation with the provinces is now provided for in the legislation. It is assured that provinces will be given the opportunity to veto certain matters, although they do not have to do it. This is true for all provinces, including the one which unfortunately was not represented by Dr. Stephenson.

The absence of representations by Quebec was a grave disappointment to me. Although I am an Ontario member, I am very concerned about my sister province of Quebec and the attitude that government takes toward participation in matters such as these. Our committee spent a considerable amount of time conducting hearings in Quebec. We visited Chicoutimi, Jonquiere, Quebec City and Montreal. We had what I consider to be excellent representations by people representing the workplace, academics and the unions from that province. I believe that their concerns and thoughts were embodied in our report as much as any others. I found it extremely unfortunate for the Quebec minister to refuse absolutely to participate or co-operate with the other provinces in relating his concerns and improving our report. I, too, saw a very long telegram from the minister from Quebec, Mr. Marois, which did not offer any concrete changes to the act, and that concerned me. I suggested to the committee that we ask him to appear before us with his proposals. While he did not appear—in all fairness to him the invitation was not extended specifically to him—I am sorry that he did not co-operate on this bill because I believe it will benefit the workers in Quebec as much as the workers in the other nine provinces and the territories in Canada.

Another concern I had was over the consultation process with the private sector. One of our report's very strong recommendations was the use of the national labour market institute. It was a vehicle which would allow the private sector to become involved in the decision-making and information-gathering process.

Once we began our trips across Canada we became concerned when we quickly discovered that there was inaccurate information as to what is happening and what will happen in the marketplace. There was a complete lack of statistics and information. We were dealing with old statistics that had absolutely no further relevance to the conditions of the '80s. We believed that a national labour market institute which tied in business, labour, the large and small entrepreneur and the special needs groups, could provide the necessary information

as one of its functions to make reasonable and proper decisions on how training should be implemented in Canada.

My colleague from Rosedale spoke earlier about the amendment he introduced in order to insert the institute into the legislation. With the amendment that was accepted today by the government, we do have the framework for that. While we are somewhat concerned about iron-clad and firm commitments from that side of the House, we do have the commitment from the minister, which he made in committee, that he and his officials will work very diligently to set up this type of vehicle. It may not be exactly what the CLC wants, or what we proposed in the task force, but it will be something similar which will provide the necessary information in order for the minister and his officials to make reasonable decisions.

Something I would like to make very clear, and I think the minister will agree with this, is that we were somewhat preoccupied during committee with the issue of apprenticeships as if it only applied to apprenticeship training. I believe it should be made clear that while part of this bill does affect apprenticeship, there is other training required in Canada for very highly technical skills that may not be of apprenticeship nature but which nevertheless is required for the use of new equipment which is being installed in offices every day. We need people who are able to maintain that equipment. Technicians are sadly lacking in Canada today. We want to make it very clear that this bill covers training of a very wide scope, but training which is required in today's marketplace. I think someone said that for far too long the Ministry of Employment and Immigration has been training too many barbers and hairdressers, more barbers and hairdressers than there are heads of hair to cut in this country. I think that points out the problem we have been experiencing. It has obviously been recognized by the government in appointing this task force and also by this bill, and I am pleased to see that.

● (1700)

The apprenticeship program in Canada is sadly lacking. We found that in Germany, for example, 90 per cent of the manufacturing industries train people. In Britain, about 75 per cent are involved in training. In Canada we found from testimony that 20 per cent train in Canada. That was as near as we could figure because information is hard to get. People like to compare the European apprenticeship programs with the Canadian apprenticeship situation, but that cannot be done. Because of our split jurisdictions on various aspects, provinces have jurisdiction over education and that has been confirmed in the new Constitution. Other countries do not have those problems. I think that is the first point.

The second point is that we found that young people in European countries who sign on for apprenticeship finish that apprenticeship. It is like going to school. They are assured that they will finish that apprenticeship if they pass all the way along. They are not guaranteed jobs at the end, but they are assured of that apprenticeship and that if there is a slight slowdown in the industry, the apprentices are not the first to go. They are guaranteed that they will finish their course