

needs, but it certainly goes in the direction of the main recommendations of the task force. Of course, there is still more to be done in other areas, areas of mobility, areas of literacy training, areas of federal-provincial co-operation, areas of forecasting and information, all of which are important to the whole field of training and specialized education.

This bill is an important step and should be supported by the House. I will be looking forward to the sessions in committee. Perhaps some improvements can be made there. Nevertheless, I want to go on record today as pointing out that this bill is a very important step in line with the recommendations of the task force report.

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to place a few brief remarks on the record with respect to Bill C-115, to establish a national training program for occupational training. Undoubtedly, in the 1980s occupational training will be of vital importance to the work force, both present and future. Young people leaving secondary school will need skilled training to equip them to play a part in the work force of the 1980s and the 1990s. The not-so-young people who find themselves unemployed for reasons beyond their control will want retraining so that they can continue to participate in the work force.

The situation is aggravated by the current depression, caused by the Liberal Party's high interest rate policy. Unemployment has reached 10.2 per cent. It will probably go higher, as the November budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and the National Energy Program continue to cripple the Canadian economy.

The subject of occupational training is a national one. It is so vast that one cannot deal with it extensively in the short time allotted to it. I would like to deal with areas, some touched by the bill and some not touched by it, which are important to my riding of Simcoe North and which interest me as a Member of Parliament.

I was quite interested in the all-party task force report on labour market development in the 1980s. Some of the findings of that task force report are of particular interest to me and I would like to read a few of them into the record.

That report signals some important shifts in the demand for labour. It suggests that more jobs will be created in the resource industries, in non-residential construction, capital goods manufacturing, and high technology areas including communications, information and business services.

Fewer production jobs will exist in manufacturing based on standard technology, especially for relatively unskilled workers. There will be a marked, slowdown in the growth of jobs for clerical and office workers and for personnel in health, education, public administration and other service industries.

In the 1980s a larger share of employment growth is likely to occur in the goods-producing industries, in contrast to the 1960s, and early 1970s when the service industries provided relatively more of the new jobs, jobs of a kind which could be more easily filled by young new entrants and by women re-entering the labour market.

More attention will have to be paid to ways and means of integrating women into jobs in the goods producing industries,

National Training Act

which they do not now enter in large numbers. We will have to pay more attention to the training of workers for the high-skill trades, particularly those skills used in the goods producing industries. More attention will have to be paid to measures designed to facilitate the adaptation of workers already in the labour force to changing industrial occupational and geographic structures of demand.

I am convinced that we can meet that demand in Canada with a co-ordinated effort. While it is true that under our federal system the provinces are responsible for education, we cannot hide behind that division of powers if Canadians are not given enough opportunities to equip themselves with skills which will enable them to earn a living. Unemployment is a national problem and we have to take action on a national basis. Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that we want Ottawa bureaucrats in the position of sole responsibility to decide on what should be done, because that would be a disaster. Ottawa is the ultimate company town, insulated from the reality of the marketplace, from the reality of where the jobs are. I suggest that to solve this problem we will need co-operation between the federal government, the provincial governments, the community college personnel and industry. All of these have a piece of the ideas on what is going on in the real world. These other parts must be actively consulted.

We are fortunate in Ontario in that we have developed a network of strong community colleges. Working within that provincial framework they have continued to offer courses which equip young people to earn a living. The House will be interested to know that my information is that the community college system works differently in different provinces. I understand, for example, that in Quebec there is very little communication between the community college system and the Canada Manpower offices, whereas in Ontario there is a great deal of communication between those two bodies.

It is also my understanding that the representatives of the community college system in the maritimes are amazed at the autonomy which the community colleges are given in Ontario to operate courses which apply to the marketplace. I am led to understand that in the maritimes they operate as an integral part of the provincial educational system. I think the federal government would do well to assist community colleges in various parts of Canada to develop systems of co-operation and systems of delivery which will give the best possible skill training to young people.

• (1650)

It is my understanding that the community college system desperately wants a better system to determine what the manpower needs will be in the future, and that system has to be developed on a national basis. Officials of the Department of Employment and Immigration admit their inability to project manpower needs. One official of the department is quoted as saying: "We have an expensive system, computers, etc., but nobody can say how many people of any particular