

It would make our labour force and our industries less and less competitive. For those who sometimes accuse the free trade agreement of being the reason that many of our manufacturers have left this country, a closer examination of the decisions by those who have left should be made. It is more often from those who have gone because they believe the business environment, certainly in the province of Ontario where I come from, is driven by the costs imposed on business by the province of Ontario and not by the free trade agreement. This has been the chief reason that they have felt the competitive economy that they need to work in is not going to be here at least as that economy is being developed by the governments they see.

Consequently, this government has dedicated more dollars to job training and skill enhancement than any previous government in Canada. This year, over \$3 billion will be spent by the government on the UI fund, on training allowances and on employment programming. The investment was not made hastily, and the ideas behind it were thought out and developed through consultations with everybody the government could think of: experts, organizations, groups including the Advisory Council on Adjustment.

In March 1989, that council delivered the report *Adjusting to Win*, an analysis of the constantly evolving work place, on how our workers and businesses can best exploit the world that is coming through the free trade agreement.

The advisory council observed that the major portion of Canadian labour market expenditures were directed to income maintenance, unemployment insurance—the safety net which we all know so well—and that a much smaller percentage of our resources went into employment promotion. The council specifically recommended that governments should shift that balance.

While ensuring that unemployment insurance would continue to provide temporary income protection to unemployed Canadians, it was recommended that more resources should be directed toward upgrading the skills of the Canadian labour force. Canadians would then better project themselves into the volatile labour market of the 1990s. No one who has witnessed the host of changes brought about by something as tiny as a micro-chip could deny that today's labour force is in a state of

Private Members' Business

dramatic transition. All of us here are familiar with the important challenges posed by technological change, expanding international trade and competition as well as changes in the work force itself. That is why the labour force development strategy places such a major emphasis on skill development and employment training and I could not agree more with the hon. member for Essex—Windsor about the need to make sure that our work force is given the skills it will need.

The federal government is determined to provide leadership in helping Canadians prepare for that labour market that is coming. The task will never be ours alone. Our primary role will, in effect, be to incorporate the efforts and co-operation of business and labour. We are now enlisting the resources of both business and labour in our training and upgrading efforts.

I suggest the hon. member also ignores the successes to date. His recommendation would in fact, in my view, put a damper on the developments we have achieved. The experience of other countries confirms that business must continually upgrade their workers' skills to remain competitive. For example, on a per employee basis Canadian business spends about one-half of the amount U.S. firms spend on training their workers. That is why we have committed so much of our resources to the training and retraining of workers, and that is the motivation behind the strategy.

All the research done indicates that the Canadian Jobs Strategy has had an excellent over-all record in helping those on the margins of the labour force and those who are most in need. We are planning and designing new programs, building and expanding on the strengths and successes of the Canadian Jobs Strategy program. This year we will spend \$500 million more on these programs this year than was spent last year, \$900 million more than the year before that.

Indeed, surveys of the national impact of a series of CJS initiatives shows a success rate after 12 months of over 71 per cent.

The hon. member's motion suggests that employers are failing to provide work for the people they train. The statistics suggest exactly the opposite, that the vast majority of those who receive training are permanently on the job, thanks to the skills they acquire. I do not think from my own experience there is a single employer