

Government Orders

science and technology. Scientists I met there were utterly different from the scientists here; they acted like car salesmen. They were extremely energetic and, what is extraordinary, they had business acumen.

In the article I was mentioning, Sylvie Halpern writes: "A small town of 15,000 inhabitants can have its own technical school, provided there is some industry and specific needs for specialized manpower. The financing comes from the Lander, the 16 administrative regions of Germany".

In Germany, the regions are responsible for vocational training. The federal government does not tell the regions what they need in terms of training, they each look after the needs of their area. It is said that Quebec and Ottawa quarrel about that. I should have said at the start: "Here is a model that works, the German model".

This system has been in existence in Germany for a long time. They decentralized manpower training long ago, and they did it in a way which is more responsive to the needs of business.

Here is another interesting excerpt: "The strength of the German technical colleges resides in the fact that students come and go constantly". I must say that in the vocational schools, even in the schools of high technology, students share their time between the workplace and the classroom. They put to use what they learn and are much more capable and efficient when they get on the work market. This way, products are better, productivity is greater, etc.

It is also reported that: "Technical colleges are a new type of university focusing on practical abilities". That is what they do. The report says we simply must be more practical in what we teach instead of teaching vague notions, horizontally. We must be closer to businesses and focus more on their needs. It will be necessary.

It goes on to say: "About 800 industry professionals teach in these institutions". Their teachers are not people who know nothing of the industrial environment but only big principles learned in books. They are people who work in the industry and are well-acquainted with this environment.

• (1520)

What I mean is that manpower training must be managed by Quebec, by businesses and even by those regions with highly specialized sectors. This is the only way we will become truly productive and be able to meet the competition from other countries in a global economy. I support the opening of markets, but, at the same time, we must ensure that our labour force, be it technicians, managers or business owners, is adequately trained to compete on the world markets.

Germany is an excellent example of this. I even took the trouble to send a copy of this article to Mr. Garon, the new education minister in Quebec, for him to read.

It bears to be repeated. We will never repeat it enough because the federal government is so stubborn. We have been talking about it for the past 20 or 30 years, but during all that time we have been falling behind. That is why we have to repeat it again and again. I wonder if we will ever succeed. The federal government is so pig-headed and, as you know, it wants to keep its spending power all for itself so that it can tell Quebecers: "Look, if I had not been here, this would not have been possible". That is the idea, you see. This is not logical, this is not practical. This is not the right thing to do. But what the federal government is saying is this: "I want to impose my will. I want to prove that I am important. If I were not here, you would not be able to succeed". And herein lies the misconception.

Have I run out of time, Mr. Speaker? I feel as if I have only been speaking for ten minutes. I still had a lot of things to say. Anyway, I am very proud to have taken part in this debate.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just heard the hon. member opposite talk about the stubbornness of the government of Canada and governmental services such as the FORD-Q, the Federal Business Development Bank, and the services responsible for promoting Canadian exports.

I would really like to know whether the federal government was stubborn when it came to providing assistance to Canadair, Bombardier, SNC Lavalin, when it came to providing assistance to Spar Aerospace in Montreal and Quebec pharmaceutical companies. Did they call it stubbornness on the part of the federal government when tens of thousands of jobs were created with the direct participation of the government of Canada?

Unfortunately, the hon. member takes a stand that completely ignores such accomplishments as well as the unconditional support of the Canadian government to Quebec businesses.

The member opposite talks about the qualifications of Quebec representatives abroad, but what does he think of the appointment of the former chairman of the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Montreal, an ideologist who knows nothing about Quebec business, let alone about international affairs. You would call him a worthy representative of Quebec and Quebec business people abroad?

I know what I am talking about. I speak from experience. I have had the privilege of working in Japan myself on a number of occasions. To think that we, Quebecers, are represented by an ideologist from the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Montreal whose sole purpose for being there is to sell separatist propaganda instead of working to open up new channels of trade for Quebec businesses, I say it is time that we determine how useful