

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer)—Farm Credit Corporation—Availability of funding. (b) Advance crop payments; the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser)—Environmental Affairs—Request that acid rain subcommittee be reactivated; the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaiel)—External Affairs—Inquiry respecting measures government intends to take to help Lebanon.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL TRAINING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy that Bill C-115, to establish a national program for occupational training, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on Bill C-115, to establish a national program for occupational training, with a certain amount of satisfaction. I guess everyone who sees the fruits of his or her labour suddenly arrive in some form of a legislation has a feeling of satisfaction, as I do today.

For a moment I should like to discuss the work of a task force which was chaired by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand). Six of my colleagues in the House of Commons were members of the task force, one of whom, due to sudden death, is no longer with us. We miss Bruce Lonsdale around here immensely. The seven of us got along well. We travelled the country from coast to coast over a period of approximately 12 months. We sat down to write a report which took a couple of months.

The report of the Special Committee on Employment Opportunities for the '80s ended up producing 186 recommendations, of which there were only minority reports written on three or four. This shows most graphically how well we got along, how we co-operated, and how we saw the problems associated with manpower training and a whole scope of issues once we got out there and experienced them first hand. I congratulate the government for setting up the task force. Some task forces have been more productive than others, but I think some very, very useful information has come out of every one of them. I think the minister will agree with me that Bill C-115 is the result of this task force and others which he had set up within his ministry. He may comment on that later.

National Training Act

There are a number of task force recommendations which are embodied in Bill C-115. The feeling, I suggest, is very similar to being a father; you experience the thrill of seeing something born after working so hard at it for so long a period of time.

● (1650)

I rise this afternoon with a good feeling in my heart. Now that we have Bill C-115 which does encompass certain recommendations from the committee, I hope that the minister will now convene the committee again for a meeting with himself in order that we may discuss some of our recommendations which have not yet been considered. Since the report was filed last October we have not had the opportunity to discuss with the minister which recommendations he does not favour and which ones he may be working on at the present time. Obviously, we know the ones which he favours because he has implemented them. However, I think a follow-up meeting is important because we hear the criticism from people time and time again that a matter is being studied and it will only result in another report which will end up on the shelf. We do not want that to happen.

We would like to see similar action taken to that taken by the task force on the handicapped and their follow-up on the Obstacles report. I would like to suggest to the minister today that he return with a counter report in order to reveal what has been accomplished, what is being considered and what has been rejected. That would be a very positive gesture on his part.

My colleague the hon. member from Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) mentioned the legislation process earlier and how well this particular process worked. There were a number of factors which arose from the process. We had a small committee which was comprised of members who were very knowledgeable on the subject we were discussing. No one was there to protect the government's rear flank or with any other similar motive. Our purpose was to attempt to reach a common goal. That process, I believe, could be used in many other areas. For instance, I see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove) sitting in the House. I believe that when he is dealing with housing issues he should take a lesson from the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy). The graphic example given to us by that minister was very important.

While I say this with all kindness, I am not quite sure what happened to the minister's point of view between Tuesday's meeting and Thursday's meeting. My first concern in committee was co-operation with the provinces. On Tuesday the minister said that too often they—meaning the provinces—approach it as a one-way street: we co-operate and consult, and they simply decide. He went on to make a number of statements as to why certain provisions could not be put in the bill to assure co-operation with the provinces. One concerned the discussion of veto in course content and the construction of certain buildings within provinces that the federal government might fund. He summed it up to us on Tuesday by saying: