

that "there is a big element in industrial training that I do not think we have totally exploited yet." (4:24) The Division receives more requests from employers to enter into industrial training contracts than it can meet with the existing allocation of funds. It is clear that the institutional side of training commands an unreasonable proportion of training funds. As a result the Division is locked into a set of commitments to the provinces on the level of institutional training it will finance which seriously restricts the assignment of additional financial resources to the industrial side of training.

The Division is also still apparently unhappy about its relations with employers in earlier on-the-job-training programs which were discontinued when evaluation suggested that the employers were exploiting them, and little return was received for the investment in real training terms. Before any expansion in industrial training takes place the Division apparently wishes to develop enough safeguards to prevent such a program from affording a straight subsidy to those employers who participate for training they would ordinarily finance themselves.

This resistance of the Division toward assisting courses mounted by employers is unfortunate. Training an employed person to a higher usable skill opens a vacancy for someone else. Training a new entrant in the labour force in an actual work setting provides that practical experience he must have to compete in the job market.

It is now time that a substantially increased proportion of training financed by the Division should take place in the employment environment as opposed to the community college classrooms. This is not a new suggestion. As already noted it was made by the Economic Council in 1971. It was also made by the Ontario Task Force on Industrial Training in 1973 headed by Dr. W. Dymond, with whom the Committee discussed the extension of employer-centered training. The Task Force decided that there were significant advantages to be gained by placing more emphasis on this kind of training. Because it is directly linked to employers' needs it is likely to be "more cyclically sensitive to variations in the labour market than institutional training." (20:8) The apparatus of mounting courses in an institutional setting inevitably makes it more difficult to make needed changes in the volume of training. The Canada Manpower Training Program *Report on Training Outcomes* already referred to confirms this.

Dr. Dymond pointed out a further probable advantage that industrial training would likely be less costly in public resources to operate than institutional training.

A decision to reduce the institutional training component and to increase expenditures on the development and expansion of industrial training would require some difficult negotiations with the provinces who have now built up an extensive investment in buildings, equipment and staff to support the institutional training of adults sponsored by the federal government. Obviously institutional training would continue, and provincial cooperation would be required to expand employer-centered training. As the Ontario Task Force