

*Supply*

to hire students. The Canadian Government came out with programs which have effectively allowed thousands of students the opportunity to go back to university or community colleges and continue their education.

● (1720)

For those young people who have the education they need but are unable to get that very first good job, we have a new technology employment program. It offers employers a wage subsidy to hire recent graduates trained in scientific or technical areas but who are temporarily unable to find work in their own field. This year we expect to spend some \$1.5 million on that program and thus help several thousand students. I would also like to mention new pilot projects being developed to meet the special needs of the young workers. These projects have been conducted at the University of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba. About 580 students are benefiting from jobs which provide them with the money they need to continue their studies and at the same time gain the experience they need to enter into the labour market.

I am going to conclude by saying that unless we help our youth with the difficult transition from school to work, we risk losing their production potential. This issue crosses jurisdictional lines and it requires a concerted and co-operative effort on the part of the Provinces and the federal Government, and I think business, labour and educational institutions, to develop a new and effective strategy to aid our young people and hopefully bring down this tremendously high unemployment rate amongst that group.

**Mr. Keeper:** Mr. Speaker, the Member presented a very thoughtful address to the House and I want to put a question to him in the same vein. The Hon. Member mentioned that he agreed with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) on the need for looking into the future for possible new definitions of work and that whole area. At first I thought, why is the Government not sponsoring such a forum in order to get this sort of thing done? But later on he said he thought, on the basis of his talks with people at the Brookings Institute who were not very successful at predicting needed jobs, that this whole question should be tied to the private sector. I want to put two thoughts forward and ask for the Hon. Member's reaction.

Why has the Government not yet chosen to support the Labour Market Institute, an institution created by business and labour with a view to finding a practical way of getting a handle on what kind of jobs are needed and what kind we should be training for? This kind of institution could have access to information from the business community which otherwise is not available. That would be a way of predicting what we need to train people for. The Hon. Member also emphasized the private sector and how education in Europe can be a way to get into the work environment and the marketplace. The National Training Act, when it came down, really continued the old system of simple subsidies—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member should make a brief point or ask a question.

**Mr. Keeper:** Thank you for the reminder, Mr. Speaker. The question is basically this: why has the Government not moved to put in place a training system located in the private sector? An example would be the grant and levy system which we proposed in earlier discussions.

**Mr. Frith:** Mr. Speaker, the Member mentioned two particular projects I am not familiar with. But if you look at the National Training Act, I know the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy), when he introduced that Act, mentioned that it is flexible enough to utilize Government funds on creative projects. My suggestion to the Hon. Member is that he approach the Minister and ask him to take a look at them. It does not mean that every project put before the Minister is going to be funded, but I do know we have done some innovative things using the national training centres across the country. I think there is tremendous potential there. I am involved in a project, as the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) knows, with the University of British Columbia and the riding of Quadra, trying to utilize the Act to retain young Canadians in western Canada in the medical technology field. So it should be innovative that way.

As to the reference to the Brookings Institute. By no stretch of the imagination am I saying that we should not be funding these futurist conferences. One of the major things we as politicians will have to do, regardless of political Party, is to educate the Canadian public as to what is happening with respect to the information explosion and the effect it is going to have on all sectors of the economy and employment opportunities. This does not apply just to youth; it concerns the need to have continuous retraining throughout our lifetime in different fields. The conferences I mentioned can go a long way to achieve that goal. I think it is very important that we teach Canadians not to be afraid of the future, that change—even chaotic change—does not necessarily mean there has to be fear. Change, if it is properly harnessed by Government, business and labour, can be an enriching experience of great benefit to those affected by it.

Coming back to the other area, the experience in the United States, when you look at the amount of dollars being pumped into the system, you will find that in Canada we will spend on a per capita basis three times the amount of money spent in the United States. We are beginning to realize that you have to tie that to the private sector because it is on the leading edge of technological change and it sees it every day because it is out in the marketplace. I think that is where we should be putting more of our funds.

**Mr. Gilchrist:** Mr. Speaker, the subject raised by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper) is of course a very sensitive point and an important subject. It has been responded to in a sensitive manner by the Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith), and I would like to pose a question to him.