

*National Training Act*

inherent in it is the principle that we would move toward an institutional framework.

In the meantime, what this section does do is very clearly enunciate what has been part and parcel of the national training plan, which is that we want to incorporate information statistics and data from both provincial governments and from the respective elements of the private sector. This amendment codifies in the statute our intention to draw upon the resources and information of the different elements of the labour market, for the kind of valuable assessment we need. The amendment does not mention the labour market institute although we are well on the way toward achieving our goal. It clearly establishes the basic objective of the national training program which is to work in a consensual fashion to bring about the co-operation of different parties.

The ramifications and implications of the wording have been checked by officials in the Department of Justice, and as far as they are concerned it is quite correct and they are happy to accept the amendment offered by the hon. member for Rose-dale.

• (1610)

**Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James):** Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party support this amendment because it is an attempt to embody the principle of the labour market institute in legislative form.

In reply to questions in committee the minister indicated that he was in favour of the principle of the labour market institute and this amendment reiterates that commitment on behalf of the government. This is important because the institute was conceived by both the business community and the labour community, by the Business Council on National Issues and the Canadian Labour Congress. It was conceived to meet a need to identify, clearly and pragmatically, training requirements for the future. This can only be done by an independent institution which involves direct participation by business and labour.

We support this amendment but I caution the minister that the negotiations which must obviously follow this legislative statement of principle and the underlying concept of the labour market institute must be respected and implemented in full, so that we do not end up with a watered down version that will not do the job.

Amendment (Mr. Crombie) agreed to.

**Mr. Axworthy** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** When shall the bill be read the third time?

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** By leave, now.

**Mr. Axworthy** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

**Hon. David Crombie (Rose-dale):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on third reading which relate not only to the principle of the bill but also to the process by which it has finally reached this stage. I had the opportunity to speak at length on second reading of the bill when I described the historical development of technical and technological education in this country. I made the point that, by and large, since 1910 when we first established technological training in a serious way there have been four or five watershed years when new legislation was brought down to provide greater opportunities to the federal government to participate in technical and technological education. The result was that the federal government spent billions of dollars on thousands of educational training programs to help millions of Canadians over the last 75 years through technical and technological training.

I felt that three principles were worth mentioning as they were the criteria by which we on this side judged the way in which the bill addressed the tradition of technical training in this country. The first of those principles was that national training should be linked to a national economic strategy. The second was that technical training should balance well with sound educational principles. The third was that in order to accomplish that balance and some national economic strategy, there ought to be fundamental co-operation between the provinces and the federal government and, by extension, the municipalities.

No one disagreed with the principles of the bill so it was carried at second reading, but there was some serious difficulty with some specifics of the bill. In our view, it had some deficiencies. It was interesting to see the change that occurred in committee. I will not go over all the changes but nine significant amendments were put forward, eight of which were accepted by the minister and the other one was accepted today.

In these times of daily acrimony it might be worth paying tribute to the minister and his officials for providing the co-operative environment in which we were able to discuss the bill. The changes were not minor or technical or grammatical changes but were fundamental changes to the operation.

Three of the amendments dealt with the relationship between the federal government and the provinces. Initially, of course, all the provinces were on record as opposing the bill. All provinces, plus the two territories, but excepting the province of Quebec, finally got together and asked the minister of education for Ontario to speak on their behalf. She appeared before the committee and met with the minister, with the result that three amendments which this party and the New Democratic Party supported were accepted by the minister. These three fundamental amendments allowed one of these traditional principles to be achieved—that is, the requisite federal-provincial co-operation. This legislation, which will be of great benefit to the country for the next 20 years in my