

*Adjournment Debate*

I ask the Parliamentary Secretary, as a representative of the Government of Canada, to give us clear and concise answers as to why Canadians in the Province of Nova Scotia are being discriminated against, while Canadians in the Province of Ontario are receiving a distinct advantage. Again I say that it is both unfair and discriminatory. I hope the practice will stop and stop forthwith.

**Mr. Bernard Valcourt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Miss MacDonald), I should like to provide the Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) with a more detailed reply to his questions of April 8, 1986 which he directed to the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) concerning an apparent reduction in federal funding for trades training in Nova Scotia.

To begin, I should like to point out that the federal funding for purchases of training programs will not be reduced this year. In fact, this year the federal Government will provide the same funding as last year—90 per cent will flow directly from the federal Government to the institutions and the remaining 10 per cent is available to flow to the institutions via purchases made by third parties under the programs of the Canadian Jobs Strategy. Furthermore, the Government has agreed to pay the provinces an amount equal to the difference if third party purchases from public institutions are less than 10 per cent. Funds will also be available to make up differences in 1987-88 and 1988-89, and to accelerate adaptation of provincial institutions and administrative structures to the needs of the labour market.

The direct purchase of institutional training programs responds to the needs of the labour market and is not arbitrarily pursued. The Hon. Member for Cape Breton—East Richmond has referred to recent lay-offs in trades training. I would inform the House that these lay-offs are not the result of any federal reduction in funds. Rather, they are a consequence of the provincial government decision to emphasize construction trades training and de-emphasize industrial trades training because of changes in labour market demand.

The demand for industrial trades apprenticeship training in Cape Breton has fallen off over the last two years. This has resulted in more funding going to another institution in Nova Scotia for training in apprenticeable construction trades than is going to a Cape Breton institution for training in apprenticeable industrial trades. However, this choice is a provincial responsibility. The federal Government cannot be held responsible for lay-offs of teachers at provincial institutions due to a provincial decision on training for indentured apprentices. As I have said, the provincial decision is based upon a response to measured labour market demand.

The Government has been involved in negotiations for new training arrangements with all provinces since last July. Negotiations have been and will continue to be based upon the fundamental principles of the Canadian Jobs Strategy, principles to which all provinces agreed in February, 1985. We

are not reducing the amount of federal dollars for training in the coming year, but we have indicated our willingness to guarantee that dollars for both direct and indirect purchases will be 100 per cent of those available last year.

• (1810)

Yes, we are proposing reallocation of some of our training dollars to increase the scope of private sector involvement in training. Reallocation of some funding to the private sector is needed to achieve the best possible blend of on and off-the-job training options with substantial but limited federal dollars.

We recognize the need to introduce change in a planned fashion to ensure stability for public training institutions as they adapt their training to tap a larger pool of training dollars outside Government.

This Government is confident the shift of some of our training purchase decisions to the private sector will result in more business, not less, for provincial institutions as the private sector begins to sponsor and pay for courses at these institutions and elsewhere.

*[Translation]*

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION (A) MATANE PAPER MILL—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION (B) AGREEMENT PERMITTING  
ESTABLISHMENT OF MATANE PAPER MILL—GOVERNMENT  
POSITION

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker I wonder if I should take part in the late show in view of what has just happened, in view of the parliamentary hypocrisy in the debate on official languages. And it is the same guy who manipulated all that who will answer me.

But I will come back all the same to the question I directed on April 7, 1986, to the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens). I asked him why he would not sign the agreement after having given his word to the Quebec minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Ciaccia, regarding the Matane paper mill.

Mr. Speaker, as in several matters concerning Quebec, like the Domtar case, the Gulf-Ultramar case and this one, the Matane case, people in Quebec always notice that the ministers as well as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) do not keep their words.

In this case, the request does not come from just anybody. It is from a Minister of the Government of Quebec and I think I have a lot more confidence in him than in the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion. These two peoples agreed on one common action. The Minister gave his word that he would sign the joint letter that he had received from Mr. Ciaccia following negotiations with officials. Mr. Ciaccia also sent the letter to the company so that it could discuss the proposals, that is the grant proposals as well as other opportunities made available by the government.

The Quebec minister knew, as well as his federal counterpart, that the company was to be involved in a takeover and