

*National Training Act*

training we need." That is a tragic commentary on something which could very well be co-ordinated on a national basis. The Canadian occupational projection system is being put forward as the answer to that current lack of understanding and information.

Do hon. members know where COPS is going for its first information? Do hon. members know what will be the basis of where we head in the 1980s? It is the 1971 census. The first thing COPS is going to do is put the 1971 census on the record. I suggest that COPS start with the 1981 census and get going with respect to where we require skill training in Canada, and forget about 1971 because that is past history. That census is outdated in this day of rapidly changing demands for skilled individuals. We should be dealing with the 1981 census and not the 1971 census.

Under Clause 8 of the bill the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission is authorized to enter into contracts for the provision of occupational training courses with persons or groups other than employers or groups of employers where the latter are unable to operate a course or arrange for training. The organization in question must be registered, licensed or otherwise authorized by the government of the province where the course is given.

It has been suggested to me that that is exactly where the breakdown occurs, because there seemed to be agreement among all of the community college representatives who were at the meeting at which the minister spoke last week or the week before that in most provinces it is very, very easy to get a licence to operate a course, and if that is the safeguard, I suggest to the minister that there must be better safeguards than just the holding up of a licence to allow the federal government to enter into these arrangements.

I am also concerned about exactly what occupations will be considered national occupations. For example, it was reported earlier this year that chefs and cooks will be considered surplus occupations. That prompted a letter to me from one of my constituents, and in that letter he said:

Since I have been in the country I have been employed by five different establishments as a chef. All of the positions could and should have been filled by a Canadian providing they were trained and qualified to meet the requirements. They obviously are not.

This does not lend credence to the statement that chefs and cooks are involved in a surplus occupation.

In fact, in the establishment where this gentleman works the sous-chef and he are the only chefs with papers.

—in Europe the training involves a period of two years full-time before entering the industry at the bottom. At this time the trainee has his or her required qualifications.

This is an individual in my riding who read an article in the newspaper which declared chefs and cooks surplus occupations. Fortunately, this gentleman had the presence of mind and the concern as a new immigrant to this country to write me, a Member of Parliament, and point out this discrepancy. When we looked into it, we found out this gentleman has a very good point. The Canadian Restaurant and Food Services Association estimates that 8,000 skilled food preparation personnel are needed each year, yet there are only 3,300

graduates per year. I suggest that an over 50 per cent difference certainly does not warrant the profession of chef being declared a surplus occupation. We must look into these matters before we decide holus-bolus what is a national occupation what is not.

One other thing which concerns me is the fact that the bill does not address the problem of mobility. I am particularly disappointed, in light of the comments made by the minister that improved mobility could contribute to the elimination of skilled labour bottlenecks. Mobility is a crucial factor in addressing the needs of employers, employees and prospective employees in Canada. It is of particular significance in these hard economic times when the economic burdens of moving to a job could far outweigh the benefits of having that job.

The Canada Act guarantees Canadians the right to move, to take up residence in any province and to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province except where any laws and practices of general application are in force in that province. Now that we have guaranteed the right to go anywhere to work, we must guarantee Canadians the right to go anywhere to obtain training and encourage them to take that training anywhere in Canada. I do not mean that necessarily means that the federal government should finance programs across the country so that every area has a program. There have to be some economies of scale that we can put into force in order to train Canadians. However, we have to address the problem of mobility because in a large and diverse country such as Canada we cannot always take the jobs to the people. Sometimes it is better that we take the people to the jobs. I think the same goes for training for those jobs.

The task force on labour market development in the 1980s said that a number of groups will need special assistance to find productive employment or to move up through a career hierarchy, and chief among those groups are adult women who will make up two-thirds of the labour force growth in the 1980s. The minister has mentioned this fact in his speeches and in press releases. What puzzles me is that I can find no evidence of that special assistance anywhere in this bill. It may come out of regulations; we do not know, but what we want to know is whether the government will implement affirmative action programs. Will the government pay additional training allowances to employers who train women? What about the mobility problems of adult women? How are these to be overcome in relation to national occupations? The attempt to help women train themselves for the jobs of the future is very important. The minister referred to this, but what I would like to see is just exactly how we are going to do it.

I would like to close my remarks by making direct reference to what, in my opinion, the community college system can do if it is properly backed up by this legislation and by a federal government which tries to bring co-operation and planning to the subject of national training. In the county of Simcoe in my riding of Simcoe North is Georgian College, which has 4,000 full-time day students. Three thousand of these are post-secondary students. One thousand of them are in business programs, 500 in technology programs, 800 in nursing and