



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities**

---

HUMA • NUMBER 023 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, May 13, 2014**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Phil McColeman**



## Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

Tuesday, May 13, 2014

•(0845)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC)):** I call the meeting to order.

First of all, welcome to the witnesses who are here. I'm going to be introducing you in a few moments.

There is some leftover business that committee members have to deal with, and it has to do with Bill C-31, which we left off, if you recall, at the end of the last meeting. We were interrupted by votes and had to adjourn our meeting quickly. This is just to finish off what I believe is a motion regarding reporting back to the finance committee.

I see Mrs. McLeod wants the floor.

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** I'll talk about the specific language, but as we heard from our witnesses, I think we have some pretty positive changes that I hope all parties will support.

I move:

That, following its consideration of the subject matter of clauses 242 to 251, 371 to 374, and 483 to 486 of Bill C-31, the Committee send a letter to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance informing him that the Committee has no amendments to propose.

**The Chair:** We have a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion?

Ms. Sims.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims (Newton—North Delta, NDP):** This does not in any way prohibit any other motions being taken through other committees or through other processes, does it?

**The Chair:** No. This is strictly that, as a committee, we've been dealing with looking at the sections that apply.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** I just wanted to make sure, Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I assume we will get it back that way.

Is there any further discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** As the Chair, I'll send that letter off to the finance committee, and now we're moving on to today's agenda.

First of all, I'll go back to my traditional introduction. I'd like to say good morning to everyone. This is meeting 23 of the Standing

Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. Today is Tuesday, May 13, 2014, and we are continuing our study on the renewal of the labour market development agreements, otherwise known by the acronym LMDAs.

For the first hour this morning, we have witnesses from the Canadian Labour Congress and the Institute for Research on Public Policy. Joining us in person, we have Ms. Barbara Byers, secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Labour Congress. Also joining us is Mike Luff. Mike is the senior researcher, social and economic policy department at the Canadian Labour Congress.

By way of video conference from Montreal, we have Mr. Tyler Meredith, research director from the Institute for Research on Public Policy.

I understand you can hear us, sir, but you're not able to see us. Is that correct?

**Mr. Tyler Meredith (Research Director, Institute for Research on Public Policy):** Yes, that's correct.

**The Chair:** We'll get by with that. If you can solve that problem at your end, you'll be able to look into the committee through the lens.

Let's begin today's testimony with the Canadian Labour Congress, and I'm not sure which witness is going to go first.

Ms. Byers, please proceed.

**Ms. Barbara Byers (Secretary-Treasurer, Canadian Labour Congress):** I'll be making the presentation, and then Mr. Luff will be joining in during the question period.

[Translation]

Good morning everyone.

[English]

We're glad to be here.

On behalf of the 3.3 million members of the Canadian Labour Congress, we do appreciate the opportunity to comment on the renewal of the labour market development agreements. We want to make four recommendations.

The first is we need to collect better labour market information. Public policy must be based on solid evidence, not anecdotal claims of a general labour and skills shortage. Indeed, a growing number of studies suggest these claims are seriously exaggerated. Moreover, the latest Statistics Canada job vacancy survey shows there were 6.7 unemployed Canadians for every job vacancy. That ratio more than doubles when you include underemployed Canadians.

Clearly, the challenge we face is a shortage of good jobs, not a shortage of workers. That being said, it's widely noted there are some shortages in specific regions and occupations. However, getting detailed information on these vacant jobs is a very tough task. The Statistics Canada job vacancy survey is a good start, but it does not provide data by specific occupation, and it lacks regional and local detail. We recommend the federal government increase funding to Statistics Canada so it can develop more detailed labour market data.

Second, we need to adopt a partnership approach. The introduction of the Canada job grant demonstrates that unilateral action results in confusion, conflict, and poorly designed programs. In contrast, studies show that labour market programs are more effective and equitable when developed in partnership with key stakeholders.

The labour movement plays a critical role in training through collective bargaining, sectoral training funds, and delivering apprenticeship programs in a variety of skilled trades. Training programs must match skills with jobs, but workers want more than just firm-specific skills. They want broadly based training that provides a wide range of skills, including better literacy and essential skills upgrading. They also want those skills recognized with a certificate or a credential so they are portable in the broader labour market.

We recommend a renewed set of LMDAs. The federal government and each province and territory should be required to establish a labour market partners forum with representation from key stakeholders, including government, labour, employers, education, and community organizations.

The third recommendation is we need to expand access to LMDA programs. The last two EI monitoring assessment reports provide details about recent net impact evaluations of LMDA programs. The evaluations show that the skills development programs are very effective. These involve the longer-term training interventions, which often lead to a credential. According to the evaluations, skills development programs increase the incidence and duration of employment, and increase earnings for people over both the short and medium terms.

This is good news. The goal of LMDA programs must not be to simply push everyone back into the labour market as fast as possible into any job. The goal must be to help workers get the skills they need to improve their long-term employability and land good jobs with decent wages.

More than 1.3 million Canadians are unemployed today. However, less than 40% of them are eligible for EI. Too many Canadians are being left out in the cold when it comes to LMDA programs.

We recommend the federal government expand eligibility for LMDA programs by establishing a national eligibility requirement of

360 hours for unemployed and underemployed workers to access training. In addition, we recommend that EI part I income benefits be extended for the full duration of LMDA training programs. People need to be able to pay their bills and put food on the table when participating in a longer-term training program.

Our fourth recommendation is we need to invest more in training. The OECD has repeatedly noted that Canada is near the bottom of the industrialized world when it comes to public expenditures on active labour market measures. We need more investment in training, and not just shifting money from one pocket to another, as the federal government is doing with the Canada job grant.

Expanding eligibility and funding for LMDA programs would not add any new cost to the government's budget. The funding would come from the EI operating account, which is made up of contributions from workers and employers. The EI fund is not currently using the full amount that may be spent on LMDA programs. According to the EI Act, up to \$4.4 billion can be spent on LMDA programs each year. However, only \$2 billion is being transferred. Further, the EI account is forecast to have a \$3.8-billion surplus this year and large surpluses in the years ahead. It does not make sense to have unspent LMDA training dollars when the EI account is in surplus and unemployed Canadians need to upgrade their skills. We recommend that instead of using surpluses to freeze or reduce EI premiums, part of the surplus should be used to expand eligibility for LMDA training programs.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity. I look forward to your questions and comments about our recommendations.

● (0855)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Now we'll move on to Mr. Meredith, who is speaking on behalf of the Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Please proceed, sir. We can see you.

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** Yes, and I can see you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Good morning. My name is Tyler Meredith, and I am a research director at the Institute for Research on Public Policy in Montreal, where I oversee the institute's research programs in the areas of skills, labour market policy, as well as pension and retirement issues.

I would like to briefly touch on three issues that I believe are central to your review of the LMDAs, although there are a number of other things that we can talk about, and some things that certainly came up in Barbara's presentation.

I think it's important to stress that the LMDAs are the principal instrument that the federal government has at its disposal for shaping and directing the interactions that it has with provinces and territories on the design of labour market policy in Canada. This is very important.

The three items that I want to focus on are: number one, improving the quality of labour market information and research on what works; number two, increasing collaboration and coordination on labour market policy across jurisdictions; and number three, providing better supports to people before they become unemployed.

The first and most significant challenge facing labour market policy in Canada is clearly the issue of access to reliable, timely, and detailed labour market information, LMI. Though there have been a number of positive developments since the advisory panel's report in 2009-10, including the introduction of the job vacancy survey, and the linking together of tax, census, and labour market data sets, our LMI system is still deficient in a number of respects. Your committee is likely well aware of these particular challenges, but I would stress that in the context of the LMDA renewals, there exists an important opportunity to engage provinces and territories in redesigning and upgrading our LMI system.

I believe that fixing LMI will require a number of changes, both within and outside the LMDA process. These include: developing and reinvigorating sectoral relationships with employers; ensuring more consistent collection of program data across provinces; renewing funding for firm-level surveys such as the workplace and employee survey, and increasing the capacity to capture LMI at a regional and local level; and finally, investing in local capacity-building initiatives to make use of LMI for long-term workforce planning, in cooperation with provinces, territories and local service providers.

For ESDC, it is also important that the LMDA process provide a better feedback loop between the design of interventions and outcomes, in other words, helping us to better understand what works. For several years the department has been engaged in efforts to use administrative data to evaluate the long-term outcomes of clients using different EBSM interventions. This is now a growing area of study in the international literature, and I would argue that it is critical for the LMDA process to provide mechanisms for provinces and territories to adjust their programs in light of this information.

On the design of programs, I would simply comment that what little evidence we do have suggests that investments in skills development are by far the most effective intervention in raising long-term earnings and reducing the future hazard of unemployment. For many vulnerable groups the key to secure employment is in raising levels of attained education and developing formal skills.

My second point relates to the limited extent of collaboration and coordination between and among federal and provincial partners. For various reasons, since the introduction of the LMDAs in the 1990s, transfers and policy-making have proceeded on a bilateral basis between the federal government and each province or territory. While this is not unique to the area of labour market policy, it has in many respects inhibited responsiveness to labour market concerns at the national level.

The weak institutional characteristics of the Forum of Labour Market Ministers has meant that there is limited capacity for knowledge sharing, harmonization and collaboration in program development across provinces, and there exist few incentives for programs to support pathways for workers that may extend beyond

one province's or territory's boundaries. It is vital that the LMDA process provide a renewed governance mechanism that goes beyond bilateral policy-making, and enables an active pan-Canadian forum for planning, priority setting, and intergovernmental collaboration and experimentation.

My final point relates to the longer-term need to expand the focus of federal policy away from one exclusively focused through the employment insurance program on training and re-employment needs of Canadians once they become unemployed. In this respect I believe that the Canada job grant is potentially a significant departure in policy as it recognizes the need to support training investments within firms, and to assist employees in moving up the skill ladder, in addition to those Canadians who are unemployed.

With so much public investment focused on the traditional education pathway for those zero to 25 years of age, Canada needs to better develop the system of supports available to Canadians to upgrade their skills later in life, and preferably before they become unemployed.

• (0900)

If employers are unable or unwilling to make these investments in their own workplace, there must be adequate supports to assist workers with the time and opportunity cost of upgrading skills.

As the next generation of LMDAs come on stream over the next decade, Canada's labour market will undergo profound changes as labour force growth slows and baby boomers continue their transition from work to retirement. Adapting to this new normal will require a stronger focus on investments in skills and more effective LMI and program design.

I can comment on a number of other aspects, but given the available time, I think it's best that we leave that to the question and answer session.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Meredith.

We'll move on to our first round of questioning. They're five-minute rounds.

Madam Sims.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Let me congratulate Barb Byers on her recent election to the Canadian Labour Congress as secretary-treasurer. Welcome to this panel in that capacity.

As you know, over the last year or so we've heard a lot of controversy around the Canada job grant and the way it was rolled out. In other words, decisions were made on the parameters around its administration even before any serious consultation occurred. All the provinces rejected that particular approach, and it took months to reach individual agreements with one province at a time. During that time, much time was wasted.

Do you believe we need a different approach when it comes to LMDAs?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Yes, absolutely. My experience over a long time working in this area has been that we need labour market partner forums.

I think what happened with the Canada job grant could have been avoided if there had been discussions not only with the provinces and territories, but also with labour, employers, and community agencies. They should get into a discussion not so much about a specific workplace but about what we need for a national employment policy. If we have this at the provincial and territorial levels, then we also obviously need to have the same thing at the federal level, but there is a different way of doing things. You can't just come in and decree it.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** As you mentioned, access to EI is at a historic low.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Yes.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Only four in 10 unemployed Canadians are eligible, yet we have an account that has quite a surplus growing, as you know.

When only people who are on EI can access training, this becomes really restrictive as well. What are the consequences of such limited access, especially for Canadians seeking longer-term employment opportunities? How could access to training be improved?

You made a couple of suggestions. Maybe you could expand on them.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Sure.

We have recommended that access to training for EI-eligible people be at 360 hours. People have heard that consistently from the Canadian Labour Congress over a large number of years.

We need to ensure though that somebody doesn't get partway through longer-term training only to have somebody say they're no longer EI eligible. That's why we've said that as long as they're in the training program they started in, they should be able to continue getting access. Ultimately, people make decisions, as everyone does, about whether they can afford to put food on their table, whether they can pay their rent, these sorts of things. You can't have the support you started with being yanked.

I found out this morning that in my home province of Saskatchewan—I believe Saskatchewan has that sort of provision. If somebody is partway through the training and loses EI, then there are provisions for that, but we need to have better access.

• (0905)

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Thank you.

Public accounts show that the government refused to spend all the money it was granted by Parliament on basic skills and literacy. What would you say the impact of this was on workers and on job creation?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** It had a huge impact on workers.

A variety of people are trying to get into training, particularly in the essential skills and literacy area. This is an area that was much more vibrant in the Canadian economy. We had more agencies. The labour movement had played a really active role in on-site workplace literacy programs. That support isn't there for people anymore. We're trying to get people to upgrade their skills, but some of them need basic skills as well.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Thank you very much.

How am I doing for time, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** You have 30 seconds.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** I have 30 seconds. Let's see what we can do.

Currently there's a push to get people back to work and into any job, never mind the skill sets they have or the ones they need to develop. What kind of an impact does this have on the workforce?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** It's a revolving door of unemployment for people. That's what it amounts to, because you're pushing people back into jobs without security again, so they end up back into the system. Then they get blamed for being sort of repeaters, when in fact it's the system.

What would be better is to let people develop skills that are going to last in the workplace, that will get them decent jobs, decent employability, and then work from there.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Mayes, for five minutes.

**Mr. Colin Mayes (Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC):** Thank you to the witnesses for being here today.

For the record, I've sat on this committee I think for four years now. We did a study on skills training shortage in Canada for about a year. We talked to labour groups and we talked to educators. One of the things we found was that there was a need to connect the employer with the program. Until that came out, that hadn't happened. That was the purpose of the Canada job grant, which I think was the right direction. We had support by all the stakeholders. One of the challenges was implementation, and we have fixed that. But ultimately, that was the purpose.

I want to go on to a question for the Canadian Labour Congress regarding some comments suggesting the federal government should allow employed workers to access EI benefits for education and training leave as part of formal training planning.

I agree with that. I've actually suggested that at this committee.

One of the problems is that those who are employed and doing an apprenticeship have to leave their employment to go for their training and, of course, they are restricted only to the amount of EI. Even so, if you extend the EI, it really isn't enough for them to get by on if they have a mortgage to pay and a family to support.

The question I have with regard to that is, what do you think the cost of that might be? Also, how do we ensure the employer has some skin in the game when it comes to upgrading the training and skills of their employee?

I know the EI fund is supported by employees and employers, but still there is an advantage to the employer when one of his or her workers goes to get training. I know in my business, what I did was to pay their wages right through because I knew they would stay with me if I supported them when they were going through their training, and they did.

Could you comment on some of those things I've just mentioned?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** First off, we would like to have more employers like you if we could.

The long-time stand of the Canadian Labour Congress in terms of EI dollars is that we need to increase access for people. That's why we've consistently said 360 hours for all eligibility. We need to increase the benefits because, again, they are too low, and we need to increase the duration.

We agree employers need to put more skin in the game, if you want to call it that. They need to have more investment in training. For a long time we have been promoting as well a 1% training levy, similar to what they have in Quebec and what they have in other countries as well. What we need to do is make very clear that the training employers are putting into this is not to then basically keep people only in their workplace, because what people want as well are portable skills.

You're quite right that employees who feel they are being treated fairly by employers and have education opportunities will likely stay with the good employers they have. At the same time, there are circumstances where people want some portability. They need to be able to move. So yes, we agree employers need to be engaged more.

If we had a labour market partners forum, though, you would have more engagement by employers like you, but also by labour, by governments at all levels, and by the community groups that are involved in education. Yes, employers need to come in with more, but it can't be on the expectation that they're training somebody to be an underwater basket weaver for one company and not an underwater basket weaver certified for all companies.

• (0910)

**Mr. Colin Mayes:** I totally agree.

One of the things we heard through the witnesses during that study was that there are employers that would have an apprentice on the workforce, and as soon as they got to the third year or the fourth year they would let them go because they would have to pay the higher wage. That was the whole idea of trying to get employers involved in the training.

It really is short-sighted on the part of an employer. I don't think that's the norm, but I think that's the case for a few. It does happen.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** It does happen. Sorry, but it also makes an impact if I'm an apprentice and I know I'm going to lose my job if I get journeyman status. Guess what I'm not going to do? I'm not going to get status.

**The Chair:** That actually is just over five minutes, so I'm going to have to cut you off at that point.

Mr. Cuzner, for five minutes.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** At the risk of being seen as kissing up to the witnesses, although Barb started it with Colin, in both presentations, I thought you brought out the main concerns that we've held for a bit now. I want to recognize that.

Both witnesses made reference to the surplus in the EI account.

If I could get your comments, Barbara, you indicated as well that you see this best used by being applied to training and skills upgrading, and what have you. Play that off with the fact that there's a train of thought that says to give a tax break to those who create the jobs, the employers who create the jobs. Perhaps I could have your

comments on that, as to where to best go with some type of reduction. Or should there be a reduction in the premiums for EI? Then I'll ask Mr. Meredith the same.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Sure. Our position is very clear. Let's put the money into the people who need to get the training, because we haven't had much success with reducing EI premiums and then having all sorts of training being done and jobs being created.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** We've had success in reducing the premiums.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Yes, well, they've reduced the premiums, but it hasn't been successful in terms of people getting more training or the training that they need or the jobs that they need.

What we would say is, let's put the money into the training. Let's put the money into access for people to be able to access their EI fund. It is their fund.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Mr. Meredith.

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** I have just a couple of points.

On the first question, in terms of the surplus in the account, I think it's important to remember what's happening with the overall actuarial position of the account. What I would say is that at the end of the actuarial period where we are expecting the account will balance, and I can't recall if that's 2016 or 2017, but I think there is certainly opportunity at that point to use some of the room in the EI rate to look at how we make investments in skills. I think that's a very appropriate thing to be doing.

One thing I would stress, though, is that my concern is about the investment in skills for everyone, not just simply for the unemployed. It's very important that however we look at which mechanism we want to use, whether it's EI or not—and I certainly would prefer to begin to break down some of the barriers among the funds that we have available for people who are qualified and not qualified for EI—I think the question is simply how we invest in skills. Do we make that available through a learning account? Do we make that available through funds that are set aside for an individual worker? Do we look at incentives to make the employer invest?

I think, personally, the evidence would suggest it's probably better that the money follow the person.

• (0915)

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Thank you.

Going back to the 360 hours for qualifying, could you typify who we are looking at? What type of workers are we looking at who would qualify under this? Does the CLC have a number that would reflect a change in policy to accommodate 360 hours' eligibility?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Okay. So the 360 hours' eligibility is based, just so that people realize we didn't choose the number out of a hat, on 30 hours a week times 12 eligible weeks, essentially.

What we're saying on this is this would encompass a wide range of people. There would be people who obviously are currently eligible, but there would be others who have had limited amounts of employment, who would make sure that they could then get access into the training. Right now they're not eligible for EI, so they don't get to get into the training as well, and that's a problem overall.

We have also had a long-standing provision from the Canadian Labour Congress on an EI training fund where in fact people who are currently working in a hospital and so on could upgrade their skills.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Perhaps I could interrupt you for a second, though.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Sure.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** That would go back to Mr. Meredith's comment as well, saying that if the provision wasn't tied directly to EI benefits, if there were other pathways to training dollars, then that would ratify that as well.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Yes. Now, we need to make sure that people understand that the EI fund is there for the workers and employers who invest in it, and that we don't try to dilute that.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Yes.

Have I time for one more?

**The Chair:** You do not. Thank you very much.

Mr. Butt, for five minutes.

**Mr. Brad Butt (Mississauga—Streetsville, CPC):** Thank you to both witnesses for being here.

Today we're talking about the LMDAs. There are also all kinds of programs and supports at the federal and provincial levels for people who don't qualify for EI support and so on. There is a lot going on. But I'd like to focus more on LMDAs today, because that's really what we're here to do.

I'd like to get your views on how strongly national standards should be built into these programs versus what our friends in the provinces and territories often want, which is maximum flexibility in these programs so that they can kind of do what they think is...

This is a nationally funded program. I'm just curious to get each of your perspectives on this. How strong do you think national standards should be in the LMDA program versus allowing us to negotiate different agreements for different provinces with different standards and different mechanisms to adjust to provincial and regional differences? At the federal level, I think this is always a struggle for us. We want to work with our partners. We want these programs to work for people in communities across the country. But at the same time, we need accountability for federal dollars. We need to see and to be able to measure the success of these programs in a national context.

Maybe we can start with the CLC and then we can go to the institute. Perhaps you can give me your perspective on strong federal standards versus, let's say, much greater flexibility for the provinces under this program.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Sure. I'm not trying to be too much of a politician, but I think you need to have both. There's a reality here. To go back to the labour market partner forums, you would actually be able to put that together in terms of national standards if you had that work being done on a continuous basis.

So yes, we agree with national standards, because people have to have some portability. They have to know that if they got some training in Ontario, it applies in Saskatchewan, and that if they got it

in Saskatchewan, it applies in Nova Scotia. We need to have those. But again, you're going to get provinces coming in with particular issues to be dealt with because of their situations.

I want to underline that when I talk about labour market partner forums, those are ongoing forums. I was the labour co-chair of what was the Saskatchewan Labour Force Development Board for many years. We didn't meet once or twice a year; we met regularly, constantly. These were the discussions that took place between employers and labour, between governments, about what we needed to do to build labour force development. Then we could feed that into the national level as well.

We need it at all levels. You can have it if you work together.

● (0920)

**Mr. Brad Butt:** Okay.

Mr. Meredith.

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** There are two comments I would make. First, I think if you look at the discussion over the Canada job grant, there was a bit of a pushback to say, "We're the provinces. We're in charge. Why is the federal government coming in and trying to dictate?"

I think it is entirely appropriate for the federal government, which is transferring dollars to the provinces, to have some expectation about how the programs are designed. I think the challenge, though, and the very first thing you need to do, is to have consistent data. Provinces and territories can go about and design programs based on a common set of interventions in a way that they believe best meets the needs of their jurisdiction, but if we don't have consistent data in being able to look at what's happening in the system, then it's hard to tell whether what's happening in Manitoba is more effective than what's happening in Ontario or elsewhere.

I'll give you a good example. If you look at the annual reports that came out of the previous LMDAs, I defy you to try to figure out the consistency of outcomes—knowing that what was happening in one province was comparable to the other. This is all because of the way the agreements were negotiated. You had province A saying how many clients they served, without indicating what the outcomes were, and then you had another province actually reporting on outcomes. At the end of the day, when you do an evaluation, you are able to provide some of those outcomes, but through the process, through the years, it's impossible to see what's going on unless you have access to that administrative data.

The second thing I would say is that I think this really calls for the need to have a better governance mechanism. It doesn't make sense that we negotiate bilateral agreements without having first had a conversation about what our national priorities are. That's where I think reinvigorating the Forum of Labour Market Ministers is very key. If you can start the discussions to get everyone on the same page, then I think the way the programs are designed will flow naturally.

The last point I would make is that we have to remember that there is a need for some flexibility here, because the provinces do have to integrate between their welfare systems on one side and the EI interventions they're trying to provide on the other. There does need to be some flexibility there.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll move on to round two and Madam Groguhé, for five minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé (Saint-Lambert, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I welcome our witnesses and thank them for being with us today.

Ms. Byers, you underscored the importance of evidence. The NDP has spared no efforts in drawing attention to the fact that available labour market data is incomplete. If we want to talk about labour market requirements to adapt our training policy, we must focus on the availability of verifiable and accurate data.

To fix this problem, what recommendations could you make to improve the quality of labour market data?

[*English*]

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** In terms of better labour market data, first off, we've said that we want more investment in Statistics Canada for them to be able to do this. We think they have a significant role to play. We think they have credibility with the partners and the Canadian public on that as well. We know there have been some media reports about job postings that are on Kijiji and so on, that don't provide anybody with any confidence about whether there are real skill shortages in various parts of the country as well.

In 2009 Mr. Don Drummond chaired an expert panel on labour market information. There were about 60 recommendations that came out of that panel. I believe he put a price tag of about \$70 million on them. It seems to me that when we're talking about people's lives and livelihoods, this is perfectly reasonable to look at.

We'd like to know which recommendations have been followed up on after this expert panel or why they haven't been followed up on. I think both parties here today have said that we need better labour market information, and there are reliable ways to do that.

• (0925)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé:** Thank you.

Recommendations already exist. It is just a matter of knowing which ones have been implemented and, eventually, realigning research and analysis that has already been done.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Meredith, I would also like to hear your brief remarks on this subject.

[*English*]

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** Yes, I would simply add that I think it is important to see what progress has been made on the advisory panel's work. I recognize that Mr. Shugart, in his previous testimony to you, emphasized that there had been some developments.

We do see some of that, but I think the two very critical things that we could do in the near term would be to re-establish a firm-level survey that links employer-side data with labour force data so we can understand what's happening within firms, so we can see where

vacancies are and how firms are responding to that. The second, I would say, is that we really need better data on outcomes in education, such as the national graduates survey.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé:** Thank you.

You also talked about the idea of setting up a national forum of labour market partners. As you undoubtedly know, that model exists in Quebec.

Do you think that the Quebec model corresponds to that type of initiative and that it could be used as a source of inspiration for implementing what you are proposing?

[*English*]

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** There are models across the country. Quebec certainly has one. Newfoundland has had a labour market partners forum for some time. In fact, I believe that at one point all the provinces had labour market partner forums. There was much more of a feed-in then to what the national was....

You need to include the people who actually have the investment in it: the labour organizations, employers, education, and governments. My experience when we talk about it is that there is a lot of interest in doing that, but again, provided it's not just a one-off, not just "let's get together once a year and talk about labour market information".

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé:** Mr. Meredith, I would like to hear your views on that.

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** I have still never seen an assessment of the effectiveness of the various models, but the Quebec model and those existing in several other provinces certainly are a very good idea.

I think we need to better integrate the perspective of employers with those of workers and the institutions in charge of training.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Falk, for five minutes.

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Ms. Byers, I'd like to thank you and your colleagues for attending the hearing this morning.

In your opening statement, you made several comments. One was that there's not a labour shortage, but there's a shortage of good jobs. I think in your response to one of the questions posed to you this morning, you said that we need decent jobs.

Can you give me your definition of a good job or a decent job?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Do I get to start out by saying that it's a unionized job first?

**Mr. Ted Falk:** That would be strike one.

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** I think a decent job, as we would define it, is a job that is full-time where needed. Obviously, there are some people who are going to need less than full-time work, for a variety of reasons. It would have pay levels that can actually sustain a family. It would have some job security, so that people aren't nervous that if they were to ask for their rights they would find they don't have work anymore. Obviously it has some benefits. I mean, there are issues around pensions and health care benefits, all of those sorts of things.

When we're looking at it, this has to be a job that has some stability. Too many workers are underemployed, unemployed, or don't feel they have any stability in the work they have. We need to build that up, if people are going to have confidence in our economy.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Okay. I think I follow what you're saying.

Who would you say should be doing the bad jobs?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** Well, let's work so there aren't any bad jobs. How would that be?

The fact is, some of us grew up in a time when there was part-time work, and it was quite necessary. Many of us put ourselves through high school and university because of part-time work. We're saying that those kinds of jobs deserve to have some stability as well. You shouldn't have to worry that this week you're going to work five hours, next week it's ten, and the following week none. There should be some stability. Most of us—not to presume most people's ages in the room—grew up in a time when even those jobs had some stability and were decent jobs.

I don't think there are bad jobs, necessarily; there are bad employment conditions.

• (0930)

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Okay. Thank you for qualifying that.

Mr. Meredith, what would your comments be on that?

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** I agree with Barbara, that ideally a job should be full-time, and ideally you would want to have access to employment that provides a range of benefits.

I think the better question is whether job stability is changing over time and whether jobs are mismatched to the labour force. I would argue that if you look at the data, job stability has actually been fairly stable over time. I think there is a real question about access to non-monetary benefits and the employer's role in that respect.

In terms of mismatch, I think there is a fair amount of mismatch that occurs in this country, although that happens in lots of labour markets. I think the question is more about ensuring there are appropriate access points for people at different stages in the occupational structure. There are going to be people in low-skill jobs who won't have access to a lot of things like training, versus people who are in high-skill jobs who have lots of access to training.

The question is how we break down that barrier which for whatever reason has found a person in that low-skill job. How do they move up? How do we create skill ladders over time for them to move up? I think that's the real challenge. If you look at access to training, which is a question that is very important to your review,

there is a huge barrier between people who are in low-skill jobs and the access to training they have there, versus high school jobs.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Okay. Thank you very much.

What are the barriers you see in matching the people who are on EI with existing job vacancies?

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** First off, people being able to access EI, to be able to do that, is a critical issue. If you can get access to EI, then you can look at some of the training issues. That's number one.

We should look at the EI training as a second chance for many people, because they have been in a job for a long time and then found out, through their company's going out of business or whatever it may be, that they're downsized. What we need to be able to do is make sure that those people have another chance for longer-term employment. Again, we're not just training people in the short term so they can go back to work in a hurry, even if it's not a job with some longevity. We've learned our lesson around those issues, for example around worker's compensation, when we push workers back into the workplace too fast, and then guess what? We end up having a longer-term problem.

We'd also say, and we've been promoting this for a long time—I believe I mentioned earlier about an EI training fund—that if you are working in a job and you know there are going to be changes, you'll have access to an EI training fund, even though you are currently employed. So for example, maybe I'm working in a hospital, and I know there are going to be changes. I want to work in dietary instead of the job that I'm in now. That worker who's contributing to the EI fund should have access to training so that they can be ready for the next job.

**The Chair:** Mr. Brahmi, for five minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmi (Saint-Jean, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Byers, you included the collecting of information in your first recommendation.

I work at Statistics Canada on what is called the Labour Force Survey. That survey is the most important one at Statistics Canada because it is the basis for all other social surveys. They are all considered secondary in comparison with the Labour Force Survey.

Do you think that we should also survey employers on the labour force? I am referring here to a survey that is just as serious and as much of a priority as the LFS, which would deal with jobs provided by employers.

• (0935)

[*English*]

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** I'm going to ask Mr. Luff, who is obviously deeply immersed in this in our social and economic policy, to take a run at this question as well.

**Mr. Mike Luff:** The short answer is yes. I think there was the workplace employee survey in which data was collected. Unfortunately, it's not being analyzed; it's sitting on the shelf. We would encourage more funding to Statistics Canada so that we could get at that data and have it analyzed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmi:** Do you mean the same level of analysis as the Labour Force Survey? That represents a huge investment.

[English]

**Mr. Mike Luff:** Yes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmi:** Ms. Byers, in your fourth recommendation, you talked about the Canada Job Grant. You deplored the fact that in some cases, money was being taken from one pocket and put into another and that, of \$4 billion that could have been spent, only \$2 billion really is slated to be spent.

Can you give us the clearest examples of how dysfunctional this is? Can you also tell us what the consequences are? Can you give us a couple of examples that characterize the situation you want to improve?

[English]

**Ms. Barbara Byers:** There are hundreds of thousands of Canadians across the country who could be using that extra \$2 billion for longer-term training, hopefully for jobs that will be decent and more stable. They would hopefully then not have to access EI again. There are people who certainly come to our attention on a regular basis who want to get into training. Either they know that their eligibility on EI is going to be so short that they won't be able to continue with it, or they don't qualify because of the current rules.

We're saying that if there's \$4.4 billion available for this kind of work on LMDAs, and if we're only spending \$2 billion, and then we're saying that there's a problem with training and skill shortages in the country, it seems to me that the problem isn't with the individuals. The problem is that we're not spending, either employers or governments, on what needs to be done in training.

We're going to have, as pointed out, a surplus again this year, and it's projected there will be further surpluses. We've already seen what happens with surpluses in the EI account. They disappear.

[Translation]

**Mr. Tarik Brahmi:** Thank you.

Mr. Meredith, do you want to comment on that aspect of the recommendations?

Can you give us examples of cases where the funds were not used?

[English]

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** I have to admit that I'm not as familiar with what I think you're trying to get at in that question, because I more or less look at the actuarial position of the account. I would simply say, as I said before to Mr. Cuzner, that I think, when the next rate review has to be done, there will be an opportunity to look at using some of the room that will become available.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Thank you for being so courteous.

Mrs. McLeod, you have five minutes.

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank the witnesses.

Some things, I think, are beneficial ideas, and some areas I'm not as sure are the right way forward. I do think it's important to point out that the EI fund is intended to balance over seven years. We have made a commitment to balancing it. As you may recall, a number of years in the last seven-year period were very difficult, so if we suggest that there is a surplus this year, I think we need to take that into account in terms of how this fund is going to balance. Certainly our government committed not to take it from the employers and employees, but to make sure that it had that balancing mechanism in place.

The next place I want to go I am struggling with a little. The LMDA is not to be the be-all and end-all for all skills training and employment situations. We just did a study on the ASEP program, and those are significant dollars going to our aboriginal communities in terms of some of their needs. We know we have the labour market agreements. We know we have the fund for people with disabilities. You talked about training and about the nurse who might want to do upgrades. My son is a nurse. He just did his critical care course, and his employer helped him. We heard about Colin who supported skills training. I would be a little bit reluctant to suggest that maybe the mom-and-pop operation that is really struggling just to make ends meet should sort of take over supporting some of those things that employers are already doing through increases to them.

We really need to focus on what the LMDA is, who it is there to help, and how we are going to move forward. I don't believe it is the catch-all for everything.

After we started this study, I went to the B.C. website and I read their last report, the one for 2013-14.

Mr. Meredith, have you looked at all the different provincial reports? Can you talk a little bit about the variation across the provinces? Are there some reports that we should all make sure we read, particularly, let's say, the last year's performance report from a province? Do you have any thoughts on that? Should we read them all, or are there one or two that...?

● (0940)

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** I have to tell you, as someone who tries to follow this stuff very closely, it is very difficult, because you're working with so many different data sources. I appreciate that question.

I would argue that the monitoring and assessment report is probably the best place for information on what's happening, because it's the only place you can try to get consistent data. When I've gone back and tried to look at the annual reports that the various provinces are submitting to Ottawa, it's frankly been hard to tell what the outcomes are.

I think the LMA evaluation that you received, or that you have probably seen, which was done last year on the LMAs—and it's a different population from the one you would see in the LMDAs—gives you a very good indication, which I think is a good starting point for analysis, about the effectiveness of different kinds of interventions. This is where we really don't know a lot about the long-term effectiveness of different kinds of programs and different kinds of services, because they vary.

The benefit of the way the LMDAs and the LMAs are structured is that you kind of have a choice from among five or six different kinds of interventions that you can use. Over time that should allow you to do some experimentation and analysis about what works and what doesn't. I think that LMA evaluation report is a very significant contribution to the literature in that it tells us, basically, that skill development is very important.

What B.C. is doing with their new centre for employment excellence, with respect to workplace practices or employment practices, is a very important starting point for qualitative analysis with stakeholders on how different populations find their way into work.

I think it would be really good for ESDC to continue the work they've started on longitudinal analysis on their data sets, because that's what's going to begin to tell us, for programming design across the country, what provinces should be focusing on.

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod:** I appreciate that.

You said there are six or seven interventions that you can do. Can you quickly tell us what those six or seven are?

**Mr. Tyler Meredith:** You have a basic level of employment assistance supports. When someone comes in to an office, they can get support for information. It will tell them what kinds of jobs are in demand. Then the official offers to sit down with them to provide some counselling. There are two steps there around employment supports or information and counselling to that individual. That's where most of the interventions happen for most people.

From there, whoever is working with the client, after figuring out whether the person is or is not an EI client, will in most provinces or service providers stream them into some kind of intervention, if that is deemed necessary. That intervention could be some training they are going to get in order to get a credential. It could have some relationship to an apprenticeship program. It could be a wage subsidy to help them gain some work experience. It could even be through another series of programs called job partnerships, whereby essentially the service provider, whether the province in some cases or a non-profit agency contracted by a province, goes into the field and works with employers to create partnerships in order to create work through which clients can demonstrate their skills and learn skills in the workplace.

There's a much better explanation for this than I can give you at this point in time if you look at the LMA evaluation. Many of the same interventions in the LMAs for those dealing with a different population are designed into the LMDAs.

• (0945)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Meredith.

I should point out to the witnesses that if you have, as Mr. Meredith was I think struggling at the end to provide, the fulsome answer, more information that you'd like to provide to the committee on your thoughts and views, please do so; you're welcome to present it at any time during our study.

Thank you to the first panel of witnesses for being here today. We'll have a short recess while we welcome our second panel.

• (0945)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (0950)

**The Chair:** Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. We continue with the second hour of our committee's meeting about the renewal of the LMDAs.

Joining us from the Canadian Coalition of Community-Based Employability Training is the chairman, Chris Atchison. Welcome.

We also have Ms. Monique Sauvé, the president of the Réseau des carrefours jeunesse-emploi du Québec. I apologize if I do a disservice to my French counterparts when I pronounce that, but it's not my strong suit.

From La Coalition des organismes communautaires pour le développement de la main-d'oeuvre, we have their director general, Mr. Frédéric Lalande and their vice-president, Richard Gravel. Welcome.

We will have your presentations, which will be 10 minutes maximum in length, and then we'll move on to questioning.

Let's begin with Mr. Atchison. Would you please proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Chris Atchison (Chair, Canadian Coalition of Community-Based Employability Training):** Mr. Chair, I would like to thank you and the committee on behalf of the Canadian Coalition of Community-Based Employability Training, or the slightly shorter acronym to reference us by, which is CCCBET. Despite our national scope and representation, and despite our rich history of delivery and contributions to community, this is a significant occasion for us to speak with this committee today. It provides hope that our sector will be given future opportunities to contribute to the labour market strategies that will best serve Canadians through the renewal of the LMDAs.

CCCBET represents hundreds of community-based employment and training organizations, or CBTs, across Canada. CBTs play an essential role in upscaling individuals and providing them with the best opportunity to find and maintain success in the workplace. CBTs also represent a significant human resources function to thousands—dare I say hundreds of thousands—of small and medium-sized businesses across Canada who do not have the knowledge or resources to attend to their own HR needs. These employers contact CBTs when they need people, and look to CBTs when they have jobs to fill or a training need. CBTs use their professional means and collaborative networks within communities to find the right person for the right job and the right training for the individual. They do it all. Large companies with their own HR departments will also contact CBTs to access clients working in earnest to improve their employability skills and to advance their employment opportunities and potential. CBTs are a game-changing gateway for clients, and they are an invaluable resource for employers.

CCCBET is the pan-Canadian representative of this labour market service sector that understands the skills employers want and the training individuals need. In addition, we have always been there to complement and execute the federal and provincial training agreements that are in place. Our sector currently serves clients under the four types of federal-provincial training agreements: the LMAs, the LMAPDs, the TOWs, and of course the LMDAs.

CCCBET has supported the process of devolution in each province and duly applauds the federal government for their decision to go this route. We are unanimous in our belief that the provinces and territories are better equipped to be responsive to regional and local labour market issues and that the role of the federal government is best suited to set the vision and the broad operational parameters. At present, there is no Canada-wide framework on goals, objectives, and measures. Currently, all arrangements are negotiated bilaterally for the 49 different agreements across the country. Each training agreement has different accountability provisions, making it almost impossible to paint a pan-Canadian picture to better inform the policy realm. Under these agreements there are no formal ways for business, labour, or the CBT agencies to provide consistent and meaningful data to the system it is meant to serve.

I would like to be clear that CCCBET embraces the principles of greater employment involvement in training, including more employer participation, higher employer investment, and real training for real jobs. However, given the recent and ongoing concern with primarily employer-driven programs, CCCBET cautions against similar one-dimensional approaches towards the LMDAs renewal and any resulting strategies that may exclude the values-based leadership and experience of the CBTs. With their demand-driven stakeholders already identified and poised to influence the policy for labour market services, it is critical from CCCBET's perspective that our sector be included in the discussions that will shape this new generation of LMDAs.

True workforce development needs multiple stakeholder approaches that link sector initiatives, major economic development projects, post-secondary and secondary education systems, apprenticeships, and community-based employment organizations. A pan-Canadian entity like CCCBET can assist in crafting policy based on our years of experience in working with clients, employers, and funders who engage with our labour market services and who have done so for decades.

CCCBET supports research, reliable and comprehensive labour market information, increased labour market mobility, effective employment services, and the continual improvement in workforce development practices. We have a vested interest in getting it right, doing it well, and being accountable for the public investment in the services we deliver on the ground and in your communities.

• (0955)

I spoke with sincerity at the outset when I said this is a big deal for CCCBET to be given the chance to speak with this committee today, and quite frankly, it shouldn't be. We should be sought after and utilized in consultation for the resources we are and for the labour market professionals we represent.

I want to thank you for the time you've offered CCCBET this morning and look forward to the questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We'll move to Madame Sauvé, for up to 10 minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Sauvé (President, Réseau des carrefours jeunesse-emploi du Québec):** Members of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to speak before the committee.

My name is Monique Sauvé. I am President of the Réseau des carrefours jeunesse-emploi du Québec and Executive Director of the Laval Carrefour jeunesse-emploi.

I'd like to speak about the Employment Assistance Services program and about the work the CJE are doing in Quebec to help young people and their communities. Each year, more than 60,000 Quebec youth experience success in their lives thanks to individualized support from the CJEs.

I will then talk about our essential role in matching training and jobs for all young people in Quebec, regardless of their profile; and in helping young people find their place in society by helping them to find meaningful employment, return to school or start a small business.

But first, I'd like to express our gratitude to the federal government for renewing the Canada-Quebec Labour Market Development Agreement and for consolidating the assistance provided to Quebec youth. We would also like to applaud Minister Jason Kenney's willingness to acknowledge Quebec's reality by renewing this agreement. Not renewing it would have had an unprecedented impact on Quebec youth and their active involvement in the labour market.

In March 2014, the Institut de la statistique du Québec reported that the participation of youth in the labour market had increased 16% between 1996 and 2012. Interestingly, most of the CJEs were created in 1997. Although it is impossible to establish a direct correlation between this statistic and the creation of the CJEs, employment figures certainly confirm that CJEs have played a role in integrating Quebec youth into the labour market.

The CJEs help young people find meaningful employment and complete their studies. According to a recent report by Raymond, Chabot, Grant, Thornton, the activities of CJEs in Quebec generate economic spinoffs of \$72 million annually from a government investment of \$46 million.

•(1000)

[English]

All 110 Carrefours jeunesse-emploi have been in existence for more than 15 years. They provide young adults with job search counselling, educational and vocational advice, entrepreneurship awareness, and business start-up guidance. Besides these services, their approach, expertise, ingenuity, and innovations are unique and underlie their achievements throughout the years.

[Translation]

In an environment of comprehensive flexible support that reflects their realities, the young people who use the services of a CJE have an opportunity to take part in stimulating projects and activities that help steer them toward successful employment in jobs they will want to keep and that fulfil their aspirations.

CJE clients experience success through services and projects that are tailored to their needs. This flexibility is possible because of unique and special financial support from the Employment Assistance Services program that reflects the mandate of the CJEs, and supports our work, the services we offer, and our success with young people in Quebec.

[English]

At Carrefours jeunesse-emploi we allow our services and projects to evolve with the job market reality, the needs of young adults, and community dynamics. The CJEs become innovative leaders as they initiate youth projects, new partnerships, and get involved in local dialogue on the realities facing young adults. The CJEs are an absolute must in their community. Together with their partners they help young adults become active citizens who blossom in their jobs, and are proud of themselves, with their diploma or business plan in their hands.

[Translation]

As partnerships multiply and financial contributions increase and are added to our base funding, we have been able to consolidate our youth expertise and develop innovative solutions to meet the diverse needs of young adults.

During the past four years, more than 30% of funding for Employment Assistance Services activities, that is, nearly \$15 million, has come from our community and from revenue-generating activities.

CJE services and projects are open to all youth between the ages of 16 and 35 years, regardless of their profile. Some clients just need a little boost. Others want to find out what job and training options are available to them, and some need more sustained support to deal with difficult life circumstances.

With their CJE counsellor, young people who have completed their studies will explore trades and professions that are in line with their area of study and level of education. Vulnerable youth who are further from the job market might look toward semi-skilled or unskilled jobs, or take additional steps towards employment by participating in Skills Link activities under the federal government's Youth Employment Strategy. Job placements enable these young people to acquire the basic skills they need to successfully transition to the labour market. Although the education level of CJE clients

tends to be lower than the Quebec average, ongoing support makes realistic employment goals possible.

•(1005)

[English]

All Carrefours jeunesse-emploi counsellors are well informed about job opportunities and education since they work hard for the perfect fit between the young adult's interests and skills and a quality job. This expertise contributes tremendously to facing up to one's major job market challenge: the job and education match. In recent years the CJEs have demonstrated significant efforts to increase their partnerships with school and their knowledge of all the innovative education programs.

When it comes to job match, all counsellors have been impressively creative in their approach to their economic community, by providing job fairs for young adults, promoting internships, and offering workshops on job and education conciliation. As the job-education match and mismatch becomes a reality that we need to address, all the CJEs are already acting to make all discrepancies disappear, offering the perfect fit for each and every young adult who comes to us.

[Translation]

It's only fitting that we hear from one of our young people.

Violence, bullying, substance abuse, family issues, homelessness: Jason, a current carrefour jeunesse-emploi client, has experienced all of them. He lived on the streets of downtown Montreal from the age of 15 to 20. He is now 23 years old and trying to get his life back on track. When Jason was 12, his widowed mother could no longer take care of him. "At 15, I dropped out of school because I was being bullied."

After living with three different families, he ended up in a youth shelter. "I had to find a job. I fell in with the wrong crowd." To survive, he stole and abused substances. He spent three weeks in jail. Yet, Jason says that he liked studying. With the help of Emploi-Québec and his CJE, he has his eyes set on big dreams. "I have projects on the back-burner and I'm keeping all the doors open." Jason is currently enrolled in the secondary school vocational diploma (DEP) program and has started a small business.

The work of Quebec's CJEs with young people like Jason and many other young people in the province is critical and essential. The CJEs work every day to ensure that young people can find their place in our society.

I thank the members of the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities for their attention.

[English]

It is a great privilege for me to be here.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your presentation.

We'll move on to Mr. Lalande and Mr. Gravel. I'm not sure which is going to lead, but one of you please proceed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Frédéric Lalande (Director General, Coalition des organismes communautaires pour le développement de la main-d'oeuvre):** Good morning, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, committee members, for the opportunity to present our comments in support of the committee's work.

I am the Director General of the Coalition des organismes communautaires pour le développement de la main-d'oeuvre. I am accompanied by my Vice-President, Mr. Richard Gravelle, who is also the Director General of the Collectif des entreprises d'insertion du Québec.

Following a brief overview of the coalition and the Quebec employability sector, we will focus our remarks on the three challenges to be addressed. They include how to create a direct link between training and employers' needs; how to more effectively support the return to work; and how to improve performance measurements.

We hope to show you that the Quebec model responds to the concerns of the committee and the Minister of Employment and Skills Development, who did, in fact, acknowledge that very fact last March when the Labour Market Agreement was signed.

Established in 1998 when Emploi-Québec was created, the Coalition des organismes communautaires pour le développement de la main-d'oeuvre is made up of 13 members. They include provincial coalitions representing more than 1,000 local community organizations.

The organizations that are members of the coalition play a key role in the Quebec labour market development system. Emploi-Québec turns to community-based employability organizations to assist target clients or clients with special needs and seeks out their expertise with a view to offering integrated and customized services. It also relies on their knowledge to offer certain ad hoc services linked to job searches and counselling. The advantage of involving community organizations lies in the form of intervention and a unique approach that is separate from Emploi-Québec and which complements the services offered in various regions.

Collaboration with these organizations has enabled 130,000 new participants to benefit from an employment measure in 2011-2012, which represents 47% of new participants in all of Emploi-Québec's measures and services.

I will now move on to the first challenge: How to directly link training to employers' needs.

For over 15 years, Quebec has had a unique structure in Canada: The Commission des partenaires du marché du travail. This forum for consensus is made up of representatives of employers, employees, education as well as government and community organizations. The commission plays a determinant and meaningful role in the orientation and implementation of public employment services in the labour market.

In short, Quebec companies participate to a large extent in defining labour market training needs. At present, some 10,000 companies, 75% of which have fewer than 50 employees, are receiving training and human resources management services funded by Emploi-Québec. That enables us to reach out to some 80,000 workers per year, including 10,000 who have a significant basic training deficit or no recognized skills. Companies participate in funding the training activities, covering 50% to 75% of the costs.

The problem of mismatched skills and qualifications between part of the labour force and the job requirements is one of the causes of the labour market imbalance. We believe that there must be more upstream action taken directly with companies, to validate their real labour market training needs at present and for the future. This action, with follow-up and counselling, is also necessary to integrate people who are far removed from the labour market.

For these people who are seeking services and training, it is important not to associate access to measures with specific funding sources. Flexible programs and structures which can be adjusted quickly to meet the needs of these people and the labour market must be put in place.

Now, on to the next challenge: Finding more efficient ways of supporting the return to work.

The effectiveness of the current Quebec model in terms of identifying needs and designing training and integration programs is based on the active participation of employers, workers and employability organizations. This model has stood the test of time.

In 2011-2012, action taken with employment insurance recipients resulted in \$220 million in employment insurance benefits not being required. Over five years, the economic benefits of measures for individuals are estimated at \$2 for each dollar invested. Ninety-three per cent of companies consider the benefits to their organization greater or equal to the effort they contributed financially or in terms of time by employees.

This model has enabled the development of several partnerships between organizations in employability development and employers grappling with certain labour market problems. An example of this are companies working in integration; they are involved in the social economy and combined training, integration and support, and work in conjunction with partners for the business community.

We could also mention the integration project, the aim of which is to hire, train and integrate in a sustainable way some 100 professional immigrants trained abroad in the immigration technology and communications sector. These are the types of successful initiatives that our organizations are developing thanks to the partnership and funding under the current model.

• (1010)

Finally, how to increase performance measurement.

The coalition and its member organizations participate fully in the accountability process led by Emploi-Québec. The results achieved by our members are included in the public employment services results. That means that the annual management report from the ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale takes into account the targets and results achieved. Improving accountability is always possible, and we believe that the new Canada-Québec Labour Market Agreement could serve that purpose.

However, we feel that there are shortcomings in the data collection at the Canada-wide level. We would, therefore, be very much in favour of setting up an initiative similar to the Canadian Institute for Health Information, but targeting employability and labour market training measures. We believe that an institution like that could allow for very relevant comparisons between the provinces and territories and foster healthy competition among the levels of government.

In conclusion, we believe that the Labour Market Development Agreement model remains relevant and yields excellent results. The stable and predictable funding associated with these agreements is key to success. We would not like to relive the Canada Job Grant episode on a regular basis.

However, significant work remains to be done because some federal and provincial government action lacks consistency and coordination, namely for persons with disabilities, young people, and experienced workers. We believe that we would all come out ahead if the Labour Market Agreement model was extended to fund measures targeting specific client groups.

Thank you for your attention, and we eagerly await your comments and questions.

•(1015)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you for your presentation.

We'll move on to the first five-minute round of questioning. We'll start with Madam Sims.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** My first question is directed to CCCBET, an acronym well worth memorizing.

Skill development programs have a pretty good track record of getting individuals back to work and into good-paying jobs. I think all of you have alluded to that today.

Can you talk specifically about the importance of individual and community involvement in selecting the type of training an individual might pursue, and what the perils are of an increasingly employer-focused approach?

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** From the standpoint of community-based trainers, there is a strong desire to ensure that an individual is looked at with the holistic view of addressing their needs when they come into an agency. Depending on the circumstances, the case managers, the career counsellors, and the workforce developers will work with that client to determine what the best course of action may be. It's always done from the perspective of getting the client back into the workplace, back to being a productive member on their terms, and addressing all the issues or barriers to employment that may be disclosed or discovered along the way.

There are a number of clients who may come in who don't need a whole lot of hand-holding. There may be clients who need a very light touch, who are self-reliant, and who just need a wake-up call, and send them on their way. They are very goal focused, and they can get things done. But it's comforting for those people who may have been displaced from a job. Maybe they have been working there a long time, maybe they are a youth who really hasn't had to look for employment yet, and they need some direction. Those community resources are essential, covering the entire gamut of people who may need their services from the severely employment disadvantaged to the self-directed client.

The participation of the employer in the discussions about their need to be involved in the training side of things is welcomed. I guess the danger or the caution is that, without that pivot point, that organization in the community who knows both the needs of the client and the needs of the employer to help balance that.... I hope that's....

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Yes. It is.

The National Association of Career Colleges has noted that the relationship between the business and education sectors is much stronger in Germany and the U.K. than it is here. I think the minister himself has acknowledged that as well, and he wants to focus on the renewed LMDAs to sort of build those kinds of relationships.

Is there room, or should room be made, for a conversation with all Canadians who pay into EI as to how these funds are distributed?

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** Yes, absolutely there needs to be a discussion. And there needs to be further research done, because I would definitely say, from my discussions with community-based employment organizations—and even our colleagues here would agree—that this interface with employers is happening now. We're just not capturing it; we've never captured it. It's been discouraged under previous LMDAs and in the previous agreements we've had to recognize or count the work that community-based agencies were doing with employers.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** That does exist already.

**Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims:** Are there any specific barriers you've noticed right now whose removal you think might be useful to the improvement of the LMDAs?

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** Well, I think one is around the acknowledgement that the community-based organizations are doing extensive work in communities with the employers. First of all, we need to acknowledge that these community agencies are doing a tremendous amount of work with workforce development strategies, with the employers. To use a phrase that I think Frédéric used earlier, we're going upstream. We're being proactive in our engagement with employers in communities to determine what their future needs are, whether for downsizing or upsizing, and what training skills they're going to be needing. Those discussions are already happening.

•(1020)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll move to Mr. Maguire.

**Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC):** Thank you, panellists, for your presentations.

I want to go to CCCBET to give you an opportunity here as well. We're looking at making improvements in accountability in many of these areas.

Mr. Atchison, you mentioned in your opening remarks that you've dealt with a lot of different agreements. Does that provide different accountability rules? How can we combine some of those—I think you used the number 49—different agreements...better training, etc. in some of those areas? How do we expand the accountability of those measures? Do we need that many, or should we be streamlining some of that?

Perhaps you could just answer that to start with. If that's the case, how do we work together to get that done?

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** The 49 agreements that I referred to included the LMAs, the LMDAs, the TOWs, and the LMAPDs. That doesn't include the asset agreements, which are out there as well. Many of the CCCBET members would be delivering those.

There is accountability built into each one of those 49 agreements. What is lacking is a broad federal strategy that provides the ability for those agreements to be governed or to be directed by the federal government, but to be enacted and enabled in the provinces and the territories, and to take it one step further, in the communities.

The one thing we need to remember is that we can build in accountability measures, but if at the same time we're doing that we're handcuffing the service deliverers on the ground, in the field, who are trying to respond to the community need, then we're doing a disservice. We have to take a look at what those communities are doing now, what the best practices are, how flexible they're being under the current agreements, and then channel that back up and ask what broad operational parameters we can expect from the federal government in the design phase so that the actual agreements can be streamlined with full accountability to the provinces, and offered out into the communities with full flexibility and responsiveness.

I don't mean to be vague. I don't want to give you any specifics without the data, and we are lacking in that research. I think our counterparts in Quebec are ahead. They have built in some strategies that have been effective for them since 1996 or 1997, when they first devolved. They're doing some wonderful things in the province of Quebec that we should look to, but we should also make sure we include the best practices that are going on in every province, and harvest what we know is going on in all of the agreements in all of the communities throughout Canada.

**Mr. Larry Maguire:** Madam Sauvé, you're looking at a lot of youth programming and that sort of thing, and we've looked at that in my local area. Are you looking at that as a shortage of labour availability in those areas? You've looked at, certainly, vulnerable youth.

I'm just asking you the same question, more or less, in regard to accountability that I just asked Mr. Atchison. How do you judge your success rates? Is it based on full-time equivalency? Is it getting people to provide better resumés to get them out into the workforce, or is it an actual job at the end of it that is a benchmark for you?

Perhaps there's an opportunity for Mr. Lalande to respond to that as well.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Sauvé:** Thank you for the question.

The Carrefour jeunesse-emploi model has proven itself, as it can be tailored to different realities, be it for young people, the labour market or the dynamics of a specific region.

When we step in to assist a young person in difficulty who is having problems and is isolated from the workforce, we work with very specific labour market information. We work with employers, and above all, with the young person to assess his needs and to prepare an action plan that he agrees with. That way, the young person is part of a structured approach.

• (1025)

[*English*]

**The Vice-Chair (Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims):** I will interrupt for you to finish off, please. I'm sorry, but we're really short of time.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Sauvé:** In other words, the success of the model in dealing with the challenges of the labour market is due to the flexibility of our approach with young people.

[*English*]

**The Vice-Chair (Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims):** Thank you very much.

To let our guests know, we only get five minutes, and the chair has to be quite lethal about it. If you get a signal from me, it means round off, right?

Okay. We're now going over to my colleague, Mr. Cuzner.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I was expecting a kinder, gentler intervention by the chairperson.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** Thanks very much for the presentations today.

I will present my question to Mr. Atchison, but if the other witnesses would like to weigh in, especially Quebec, please do

On the repurposing and reprofiling of the LMA money to the job grant, I thought you typified your clients really well; you know, from those gentle-touch, self-directed clients at one end, to those who have multiple barriers, multiple choices at the other end. The funds from the LMA would have been directed at programs that offered opportunities for those types of clients.

Are you hearing from your members concerns around whether or not those programs for those with the greatest number of barriers... Are those programs going to be able to continue with the reprofiling of the LMA money?

Would you folks comment on that as well?

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** It's been very apparent, very clear, to us that there are large concerns coming forward to us from our membership regarding the reprofiling of the dollars under the Canada job fund across the country.

CCCBET has been around since 1993, and people who have been involved with CCCBET for that long have said that they've never seen the amount of concern raised, coast to coast, regarding the repurposing and how it may affect the most vulnerable populations.

[Translation]

**Mr. Frédéric Lalonde:** If I may, I would like to elaborate on that answer.

Given that the Labour Market Agreement was renewed with virtually the same parameters, I understand that we are not part of the same process as the rest of Canada.

The entire year was difficult for us, because we had no idea how to coordinate the Canada Job Grant with our measures and services in Quebec. That is particularly critical as the number of people served by the programs funded under the Labour Market Agreement is facing a relative increase. There are problems with the clientele. The people we serve have increasingly complex problems and are less and less the type of unemployed people we can transfer to the workforce without considerable support.

The funding under the LMA is crucial for us.

[English]

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:** I would like to get a general comment as well. Everybody has made reference to it, and I think we agree with the minister, that the business and corporate community need more skin in the game.

Do you have a general view that the bigger companies—you know, Hydro-Québec or Bombardier—are better at seizing the opportunity with training than the small entrepreneur? Or, are the larger companies looking for the already trained employee and not willing to train up? Would they sooner come in and pick those skilled people, as opposed to training people? Do you have a general feel or sense for that?

• (1030)

[Translation]

**Mr. Frédéric Lalonde:** Yes, there is a clear correlation between being an employee from a large corporation who is already trained and having access to on-the-job-training. I will quickly summarize the Quebec model.

Companies that do not contribute enough to labour market training will contribute to a fund that is used to finance these measures. We know that for small-and-medium-sized companies, it is particularly difficult for employees to have access to training. A specific attempt is made to fund measures that will target these categories of workers.

This is, in fact, a problem that is very difficult to resolve simply. It requires fine-tuned action over the long term, with a view to changing entrepreneurs' attitudes.

Having said that, we understand them very well. We are in contact and very often in a partnership with them. They face significant challenges. Being an entrepreneur is not easy. If in addition to that, we tell them that they are required to look after labour market training, it is often too much for them.

In other words, the labour market training fund is there to provide assistance that is often required.

**Ms. Monique Sauvé:** I would like to add...

[English]

**The Vice-Chair (Ms. Jinny Jogindera Sims):** Thank you very much.

I'm sorry, Madam, but maybe in the next round of questions....

I'll turn it over to Mr. Mayes.

**Mr. Colin Mayes:** Thank you very much to the witnesses for being here today.

I think we can acknowledge that Quebec is a leader in Canada when it comes to skills training, programs, and outcomes. I appreciate, Madam Sauvé, that you have acknowledged our government as a partner in part of that success.

One of the things that really struck me in your presentation was that you knew your client, their background, and those things that you worked with in that person. Instead of just a student, or a trainee, or a future employee, you looked at the person. I thought that was really great.

I just wanted to ask you, how do you approach that? When you have a client who comes in the door, do you have somebody who focuses on looking at their background to see the big picture, the full person, when dealing with that client?

[Translation]

**Ms. Monique Sauvé:** First of all, the team that welcomes the young people at a Carrefour jeunesse-emploi is made up of people who have received training for that. The majority are young people themselves. In addition, they have training in career management or social work. So they are in a position to welcome the young person from a comprehensive perspective considering all aspects of their lives. Although they are working on an action plan for getting a job, studying or becoming an entrepreneur, they look carefully at all aspects of the young person's life.

Without losing sight of the objective, which is to get a job, there are partnerships with the community that help deal, for example, with problems relating to health, or drug use. Sometimes, we deal with young drug users. We set up partnerships that help us to complement our approach with young people.

[English]

**Mr. Colin Mayes:** I appreciate that.

Mr. Atchison, in the community in British Columbia that I come from, the Shuswap construction industry professionals, the local college and secondary school, and the city—I was mayor of that city—all partnered with the contractor who built a spec house. We had nine students who were there through the whole process, right from the time they dug the hole until they put the roof on and did the finishing inside that place. The professionals in the various trades donated their time to walk alongside them when they were doing the wiring, the plumbing, or whatever it was.

It was a great successful program. Of the nine students I recall, eight of them were offered jobs after they graduated. I guess what I'm looking at is community-based employability training. I think it's so important that the community be involved in this. That worked very well for us.

Here's my question. As far as your experience goes in connecting with those people who are on employment insurance and looking to be retrained or whatever, are you able to interact there as part of the LMDAs and help those people who need further skills and who are collecting EI?

• (1035)

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** Absolutely. What you've described is a classic situation that occurs. Those individuals would have been identified, probably by a community-based employability training organization. They would have gone out and sought that partnership with the trades team, and they would have helped build that labour market opportunity for those kids.

Under the LMD agreements, that type of community response and local labour market flexibility are completely available, and it's so meaningful when community-based trainers and the rest of the employer groups, the trades, can come together in a partnership, because it is a collaboration, and it is a partnership that has to work, that will continue to.... It has to be there in order for us to have the responsive successes that we're going to need to build across the country.

**Mr. Colin Mayes:** I have one question about the potential employer. How do you work with the employer, not just with the training but with the person? You know the expectations and work with them. Do you have follow-up after they have started? Do you keep connected with the employer and employee just to ensure success?

[Translation]

**Ms. Monique Sauv :** Meeting the needs of the labour market is one of the largest challenges. We need to provide support to help them keep their jobs. That is even more true for young people who want to explore different fields of work. Helping them feel comfortable in their work environment is what it is all about.

The carrefours have developed a number of initiatives to connect with employers, be it through company visits or activities, like events where young people prepare to meet with employers to stimulate their interest, so that they can explore different jobs and want to discover their own interests and jobs.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madam Groguh .

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguh :** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for their remarks.

I am very familiar with the carrefours jeunesse-emploi because I worked in France in the local mission sector. We supported young people aged 15 to 25 in the area of social and professional integration.

I really admire the work that can be done in terms of support, guidance and employability for these young people who, in some cases, have come a long way, and I enjoy seeing the results achieved through targeted support that takes into account all aspects of the young person in questions.

I will try to be brief, because I do not have much time.

**Ms. Sauv ,** I would like to ask you the following three questions: What are the characteristics of the Quebec labour market training model and the reasons for its success. What is the impact of participation by the federal government in this area. And do you think that this model is applicable in any other provinces?

**Ms. Monique Sauv :** My colleague can expand on this but I would like to say that I absolutely agree with you.

The Quebec model does work well. Emploi-Qu bec sits down at the table with people from business, education, from ministries and from the community sector. We all sit down to work together in order to respond to the challenges of the labour market and craft an action plan.

This is a very inclusive process. It takes into account all concerns and it means that besides dealing with labour market issues, we are also able to initiate common activities and actions. As part of my community involvement, I am also the president of the Conseil r gional des partenaires du march  du travail. The Quebec model works in each of the regions. This model really works.

• (1040)

**Mrs. Sadia Groguh :** Mr. Lalande, could you expand on this?

**Mr. Fr d ric Lalande:** I will give the floor to my colleague, Richard Gravel.

**Mr. Richard Gravel (Vice President, Coalition des organismes communautaires pour le d veloppement de la main-d'oeuvre):** The partnership model means, among other things, that community organizations can make connections with businesses and find out what their needs are. On the ground, we often hear businesses speak about general knowledge, especially for less specialized jobs. They're having trouble finding individuals who meet the needs of the labour market. This is true for young people, but it is also true for immigrants because the rules of the Quebec labour market are not necessarily the same as those in their country of origin.

These connections help to develop programs that are tailored to the needs of businesses but that are also focused on a goal. The strength of the community movement is that the purpose of these organizations is real personal development, and it takes into account not only the needs of one business, but rather the full spectrum of potential jobs. We have developed approaches in various sectors of activity that are focused much more on how to transmit these skills that individuals will develop. With that global vision and thanks to this partnership, we feel we have succeeded in getting those results.

[English]

**The Chair:** Very quickly, 30 seconds.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sadia Groguhé:** I do not want to finish on a negative note, but unemployment amongst young people is still 14% or 15%.

How can your approach, which focuses on employability and guidance, be used to align training programs with the business sector for the benefit of our young people who are graduating from the school system, have good diplomas, and have followed the right course of study? I think those are the kinds of questions that need to be asked.

[English]

**The Chair:** Sorry, you won't be able to respond to that. We're out of time and we have to squeeze in one more round of questioning.

Mrs. McLeod.

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod:** I just have one question and then I'll be turning it over to my colleague, Mr. Butt.

Mr. Lalande, you said something that really piqued my interest, having come from a health care background and having spent a lot of time wandering around the CIHI data, and also recognizing of course that the delivery of health care is a provincial responsibility.

In that model we've managed to provide very robust information. Can you flesh out what you envision when you said that sentence, that we could maybe look at something like the CIHI model in terms of how we develop the labour market information we need?

[Translation]

**Mr. Frédéric Lalande:** Yes, and that is something that Mr. Atchison also mentioned.

For example, the Government of Quebec currently provides quite specific and relevant data on, among other things, results achieved, the evolution of the labour market, and so on. However, there is no organization that is responsible for comparing this data with that of other provinces.

We could use the model of the Canadian Institute for Health Information. We should look at who would be responsible at the provincial level without minimizing the importance of provincial jurisdiction. That must be taken into account. The model could take into account what is being done in Quebec, in Ontario, in fact, anywhere in Canada. Currently there is no way of knowing which measures are the most effective and which are given the best outcomes. That is lacking. Everyone would benefit from using a model like the one used by the Canadian Institute for Health Information, for the purpose of outcomes.

[English]

**Mr. Brad Butt:** I have one quick question.

I coined the phrase and Minister Kenney stole it and uses it quite a bit. It's that some agencies that are supposed to be doing skills development and good training have really become resumé factories, as I call them. Really what they're doing is they're helping people write a resumé, but they're not doing very much to actually train people or retrain people for the jobs that are available in their communities.

It doesn't sound like your agencies are like that. It sounds like, from what you've told us, you have very robust programs in place that you are doing....

What safeguards can we put in the LMDAs when we're working with our friends in the provinces to make sure that the dollars we're investing are going to agencies that are delivering those outcomes that we want, which is real training for the real jobs that are available?

What would you recommend we have to measure those outcomes so that at the federal level, we have some assurances the money is being allocated properly into programs that are actually getting people jobs at the end of the day?

•(1045)

**Mr. Chris Atchison:** Yes, I think this goes back to the same discussion about setting those parameters. I think you are always going to have people who aren't satisfied with service. Clients can come into an organization, and we can spend hours and hours with those clients to try to invoke the best results for them, and ultimately it doesn't happen. They're not ready; they're not capable; they need other investments that we're not capable of providing; or there could be mental health issues there. Those people might be the ones who are saying, we did nothing for them.

We've heard the rhetoric about resumé factories, and it's hard to not take it as an insult. With all due respect, it would be akin to our paying much heed to a Canadian saying that all senators do is submit expense claims. It's so inconceivably absurd from where we sit, knowing how much we do for clients, that you can't pay attention to that level of rhetoric. The amount of time and compassion that goes into working with clients at whatever level of readiness they are for employment is profound.

Getting down to making sure that a client comes out ready, sometimes the employability of one client might mean they need an industrial first aid ticket and that's it and they're off and running because that will get their foot in the door. Other clients need certain elements of employability skills that are more on the soft level, that are harder to measure.

To me, it's not a simple answer, but I think to get the right people, a pan-Canadian group of community-based employment trainers—the best practices we see, the best minds who want to build these accountability frameworks—and put them in a room, have the breakout sessions, and identify what we're going to need to be successful across Canada is a starting point.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Thank you for the indulgence of committee members. We've gone a bit over time here.

Thank you to our witnesses on this second panel.

I have one last comment for committee members.

We will be setting aside 15 minutes at our next meeting to address the notice of motion Mr. Cuzner put on the table during our last meeting. That's just an FYI.

Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

---





Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>