

*National Training Act*

view, starts out by offering a great opportunity to the federal government and the provinces to act in an atmosphere of harmony.

At least as important in my view is the fact that members did not come to committee to play politics. Members on all sides came to try to make the legislation better. That is why the other six amendments from this side of the House were accepted after some discussion. Members worked hard to make sure they were dealing with the problems of others and were improving the legislation for the benefit of Canadians.

The hon. member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid), who would be too modest to mention it himself, brought forward an amendment without which the bill would have applied to preschoolers, which was clearly not the intention of the drafters. The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) did some very creative work. In the morning he showed up at committee with a clear understanding of what he wanted to do over two days. By the time he was through he was able to amend clause 4(3) and clause 9(1)(a), which gave him the opportunity to make sure that the bill will be of benefit to Canadians who have special training needs. Those are people who are stuck in non-traditional roles. The handicapped, native Canadians, people who have special training needs are clearly brought within the purview of this bill. That was the excellent work done by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

● (1620)

There are other amendments which were offered and accepted in a spirit of compromise. As a consequence of a good legislative process, this bill is substantially better than the one which came into the House. Anyone who is looking to reform the House of Commons might want to look at the way in which Bill C-115 went through the three readings and committee. I thought that was one area worthy of comment because the bill is a product of this House, and I think the House should be proud of it.

As I mentioned earlier, I put forward an amendment which was ruled out of order because of its wording. The principle of that motion is now in place as the minister, indeed all sides, have accepted new wording from the law officers of the Crown. It deals with the national labour market institute, with which I was particularly concerned because the very essence of this bill, indeed the essence of technological education in Canada, is that education and training brought together will allow us to have employment opportunities, economic performance and development. This bill will not do that by itself, but it provides the framework within which it can be done.

When I spoke on second reading I talked out only of co-operation between federal and provincial governments and a balance in education and training, but of the first principle that national training in this country has always been related to a national economic strategy or set of goals. That is why the institute, while itself a small step, is a major principle, because it requires co-operation between all those people—government, business, labour and consumer groups—who speak for those with special needs. It takes the co-operation of all those people

in groups in order to target the needs for the future. Any fool can target the needs of yesterday, but it takes some sophistication and, more importantly, co-operation to target the needs of the future.

The reason it became an important principle is not mysterious, Mr. Speaker. We have known for the last six or seven years—some people knew before we did—that we live in a new technical and technological environment which is fundamentally changing the world. In mining, fisheries, forestry, agriculture, all the resource industries, the technological revolution is upon us, and if we are to take advantage of that many things will have to change. That is why the principle of co-operation was so important. We need economic co-operation in this country, not economic conflict. We need integration, not segregation. We need economic consensus, not economic discord. That is why co-operation, integration and consensus are no longer just good warm thoughts; they are now new realities.

Let me speak for a moment of an economy which has tried to work on those three principles. There is an excellent report which I am sure some members have seen—if not, they should get a copy—called “the Japanese way” put out by Labour Canada. It deals with contemporary Japanese industrial relations. In early 1982 the Canadian index of industrial production was falling at an annual rate of 16.5 per cent; in Japan it is 2.5 per cent. Between 1977 and 1980 industrial productivity in this country rose only by 2.9 per cent; in Japan it is 22.7 per cent. Expenditures on research and development in Canada this year are .9 per cent; in Japan, it is 2.4 per cent of GNP. Interest rates—the ability to borrow money to produce—in Japan are now 6.4 per cent; in Canada, they are 18.25 per cent. Unemployment in Japan is 2.3 per cent; in Canada, it is 10.2 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot argue with that reality. Some people have suggested that we cannot copy the Japanese because they are culturally different; much of what they do is related to their history and their culture. It seems to me that our own history and culture is not devoid of the principles of co-operation, integration and consensus. Indeed, those always struck me as good Canadian principles. So co-operation, Mr. Speaker, is the key to the future. The old fight between government, labour and management, the lack of co-operation, is now hurting us. Consequently the amendment we put forward which puts into the bill the principle which allows all those groups to have a say in the targeting of labour market statistics and policies may be only a small step but it is a very big principle. The reason it is in there is because members from all sides decided when they came to committee that they were going to produce some legislation which was useful, rather than politics which was not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill on third reading.

**Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on second reading to outline the social and economic problems which I felt training legislation had to deal with. Having dealt with the bill at committee it is good to have the opportunity once again to address the issue. We in this party will be supporting this legislation, but that does not