

Labour Education and Training Research Network



York University

Centre for Research on Work and Society

Suite 276, York Lanes Bldg
York University
4700 Keele Street
North York, Ontario
M3J 1P3
Canada

Tel: (416) 736-5612
Fax: (416) 736-5916

Public and Private Sector Unions in the Delivery of Training: The 1998 CLC Protocol

by

John Anderson

Public and Private Unions in the Delivery of Training: The 1998 CLC Protocol

Introduction

The Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) Executive Council passed the CLC “Protocol on the Delivery of Training Education and Employment Services” in June 1998. The adoption of the Protocol as CLC policy (see appendix) was the result of over a year of gestation and many more of gradual development of the issues it is meant to address. The issue the Protocol was to deal with was “the growth of union-sponsored and joint labour-employer delivered training, education and employment services.” The Protocol states that “we need a protocol between the unions involved in these programs and the public sector unions which traditionally and currently provide these services.” The goal of this document is “to identify, clarify roles, establish procedures and set up mechanisms for dialogue and dispute resolution.” In other words, the Protocol was developed to deal with the concerns of public sector education and employment services unions concerning the growth of union-controlled training, education and employment services programs. These public sector unions believed these latter programs could, in some instances, threaten unionised public sector jobs and the viability of the public system. At the same time, many unions from the rest of the labour movement had concerns with the kind and availability of training and employment services in the public sector.

The Protocol was initially developed by the Training and Technology Committee of the CLC, and then by a subcommittee. During the process, representatives of affiliated unions examined the issue, with the participation of the author of this paper, whose grant from the Training Network allowed him to work on the more than seven drafts of the document and to help bring the project to fruition. Various drafts were then discussed and debated at the CLC Training and Technology Committee in a very open and comprehensive fashion. Over a seven-month period, the Committee, chaired by CLC vice-president Jean-Claude Parrot, and staffed by Kevin Hayes, gradually worked towards a final acceptable document. It was adopted unanimously by the Committee in April 1998 and subsequently approved by the CLC Executive Council.

Part 1: Why a protocol?

Background and History of the Issue

The need for a CLC Protocol on this issue arose out of a desire on the part of the CLC and affiliates to resolve, or at least lay out the elements of a solution for, the issue of who should deliver training and employment services. The Protocol was not meant to deal with either union-focused or union skills training (so called “tool box” courses) such as stewards' courses, health and safety courses, and members' courses. Neither was it meant to deal with union education programs on subjects such as union history and the values of the labour movement, political education, or other issues of concern to the union movement such as work re-organization, women's issues, etc. Rather, the concern was unions delivering, either alone or in joint programs, job-related training, K-12 (kindergarten to grade 12) education, basic skills, apprenticeship, skills upgrading, adult education, college or university courses, or other programs which are and/or were historically being delivered in the public sector. At the centre of the discussion were probably basic skills programs dealing mainly with literacy and numeracy issues. ¹

Another area of concern was that, over the last 15 years or so, some unions had developed, or participated in the development of, labour/community-based employment resource centres.² In the past, these centres provided educational and adjustment services to unions. Now these centres are providing some of the services which were once delivered by the federal Human Resource Development Canada (HRDC) offices, and even some services formerly provided by community colleges or provincial and even municipal organizations.

Members of public sector unions, particularly in the education sector in NUPGE, became concerned that the growth of union involvement in training was leading to the growth of a non-public training sector. While this sector was not part of the for-profit private sector it was, they believed, nevertheless leading to the loss of unionized public sector jobs and the weakening of the public sector on these areas.

Particularly important examples of these phenomena were basic skills programs such as the much cited basic skills centres and programs run by the Fish, Food and Allied Workers' Union in Newfoundland during the period of the TAGS (The Atlantic Groundfish Strategy). When thousands of fishers and fish workers were forced out of the industry, they sought re-training in other areas. These union-run centres existed during the 1994-1998 TAGS program but have now all closed. Representatives of the community college teachers union, a member of the Newfoundland Association of Provincial Employees (part of the National Union of Public and Government Employees) claimed that the jobs of many unionized employees teaching basic skills had been lost. ³

What the Protocol is and is not about...

The issue then was not one which divided public against private sector unions: some public sector unions are also involved in training delivery. Rather, it involved public education unions and public employment services unions on the one hand, and on the other, all unions involved offering training, education and employment services.

Second, the issue here was generally the increased or first time involvement of many unions in these areas. Many private sector unions have been involved in training delivery for a long time, even before the modern public system was established. Since their development in the early 19th century, craft unions in Canada have been involved in the development of training for their members. Apprenticeship programs and training to develop skill sets have always been a part of craft union activities. For example, in 1833, the second oldest union in Toronto, the York Typographical Union, involved itself in apprenticeship programs.⁴ The issue was *new* training initiatives.

As well, the CLC policy passed at its 1992 Convention had already affirmed that: “The CLC recognizes the legitimacy of existing union controlled training programs.”⁵ This policy would seem to have assured the continued existence of the many union training programs which had begun before 1992.

Third, the issue did not arise because there was a lack of a CLC policy on training or on the role of the public sector. The CLC had developed a fairly complete program on training issues and since its inception had been a major supporter of a strong public sector. In 1992, the CLC passed a “Policy Statement on Training and Unemployment Insurance” at its 19th Convention. This statement noted “that training is a right which must be entrenched in legislation.” The statement also noted that the CLC and its affiliates will work to ensure that “public institutions continue to be the primary deliverer of training” and the “preferred means of training”.

Fourth, the issue did not really apply to the Quebec affiliates of the CLC. Unlike other provincial federations, the Quebec Federation of Labour (FTQ) since 1974 has been in charge of training and education policy; in the other provinces, the CLC has this role. The FTQ has decided simply to insist that unions do not set up their own delivery mechanisms for programs such as basic skills but use the services of public or community institutions such as School Boards to deliver training that affiliates want.⁶

Fifth, many unions have, before the Protocol was developed, established official relationships with the public education sector. For example, the United Steel Workers of America, in its role in the joint sectoral council CSTEAC (Canadian Steel Trade Employment Council), signed an agreement with community colleges on the delivery and portability of CSTEAC programs. This program allows CSTEAC courses to be recognized for credit by community colleges and peer educators to teach some of these courses as well as making community college courses part of the CSTEAC program.⁷

Part II: Why a protocol?

In 1992, the issues behind the protocol came to the forefront at the CLC convention in the debate over training policy. At that time, the CLC policy was amended to specify the primacy of the public sector in education and training. In the summer of 1997, the CLC held its first training conference in Ottawa. During the preparation for the conference, and at the conference itself, this issue once again became a subject of debate and discussion. In the end, after some debate, five key areas for development for the conference and the later strategy were specified

1. apprenticeship
2. public adult education system (high schools and community colleges)
3. literacy and basic skills,
4. skills training on the job
5. employment services (counseling, advocacy services for the unemployed and labour market information).

At the conference, education sector members of the public sector National Union of Provincial and General Employees (NUPGE) again raised their concerns on this issue. They felt that the involvement of many unions, particularly in the area of basic skills, was part of the problem rather than part of the solution. They cited the growth of union-controlled training such as in Newfoundland and the parallel loss of jobs. The issue risked becoming one which could harm relations between affiliates. It was after that conference that the CLC then decided to make this issue a priority for development.

In order to understand why the need for a protocol became an issue within the union movement, it is important to understand, first, why training became a major issue for many unions and why they involved themselves during this period and, second, why public sector unions felt threatened by some of this involvement.

WHY UNIONS BECAME INVOLVED

Changing times: an age of insecurity

The increased union involvement in training and employment services, particularly in the last decade, has come as a result of a confluence of certain factors.

A. Global/Technological Factors

1. Fall out from free trade policies and age of globalization

It is not necessary to underline the major developments in the changing world economy over the last 20 years: the expanding mobility of capital, the growing power of multinationals and the influence of those forces on our national structures. This is a problem common to all countries.⁸

In the North American context, the particular policies of free trade of successive federal governments (the Canada-USA Free Trade Agreement [FTA] and the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA]) hit Canadian manufacturing extremely hard and engendered massive job losses. These losses were, supposedly, to be accompanied by important government intervention to retrain and re-equip all affected workers with new skills. Very little of this was done. But unions and union members were and are told by governments and employers “you have to have training to survive in the new world order.”⁹

2. The growth of a “knowledge-related” or “knowledge-mediated” economy: undervaluing and overvaluing skills

On another technological level, we are entering an age of the knowledge-mediated or information technology-facilitated or enabled economy. While this does not mean that manufacturing or resource industries are less or no longer important, as some theorists such as Lester Thurow seem to suggest when they talk of the knowledge-based economy, it does mean that knowledge-related industry such as information technology has become a huge generator of wealth.¹⁰ The richest man in the world, Bill Gates, contrary to Thurow’s suggestion, is also a manufacturer, but of knowledge-based products which enable the production and dissemination of other more traditional goods and services.

Even in the manufacturing or traditional service sectors, many jobs now require new skills such as knowledge of computer-based programs in this information technology-driven economy. At the same time, particular kinds of knowledge, education and training become even more highly valued. They even become overvalued and the lack of the new skills becomes undervalued. The extreme overvaluation of new technology stocks on the market at the time of writing is one indicator of this trend.¹¹ If knowledge products and services are now a crucial part of the production and service process in most categories, it is no wonder that workers are demanding more training from literacy to computers. It is only natural in this climate that workers would first turn to their unions to demand more training and education in these areas.

3. Precarious jobs should mean even more training

The continuing climate of job insecurity has forced many union members to develop their training and education skills, or to use employment services because they have lost their jobs, or to change jobs or upgrade their job in the workplace.

While many corporations have recently made large profits, part of these profits have often been at the direct expense of workers’ jobs. The best example is the recent experience of CN President, Paul Tellier, who was voted executive of the year when CN stock values climbed each time thousands of workers were laid off.¹²

Many others are forced to work in precarious employment in all its variety. In the figures

for job creation last year, the category which showed the largest increase was the that of non-standard jobs. CLC economist Andrew Jackson observes that “on the face of it, 1998 was indeed a great year for jobs.” 449,000 jobs were created over the year, the biggest jump in the 1990s. The unemployment rate fell from 8.6% to 8.0%. And, for the first time in years, young people shared in the expansion, gaining 143,000 of the new jobs. A closer look at the numbers shows that job creation was dominated by the growth of precarious forms of work, particularly among women:

- 1 in 4 or 118,000 of the new "jobs" came in the form of self-employment. 9 in 10 of the self-employed earned just 68% as much as paid workers.
- Women "own account" workers earned an average of less than \$15,000 in 1995.
- 44% of the 330,000 new paid jobs created in 1998 were part-time jobs.
- 90% of the 147,000 new part-time jobs were taken by women.”¹³

In this climate, it is no wonder that union members demand that their union provide them with training, education and employment services. Training for one job is no longer sufficient. The precarious climate helps to foster the demand for lifelong learning. Portability in training (as workers are forced to move around), the need for countrywide standards, and government regulation of training (as one employer can no longer be counted on to provide continuous upgrading) rise high on the list of training goals.

The precarious climate has also generated the call for individual “training accounts” (USA) or individual learning accounts as they are called in the UK.¹⁴ These training directions say that we cannot fight the trend to precarious employment. Rather, it implies that individuals should now be responsible for saving for their own training and/or choosing on an individual level what trainers should get government and employer dollars. This marketization of training holds dangerous implications for the public education system.

4. The Increasing Pace of Work Re-organization

Another reason for increased involvement by unions in training has come with the consequences of the technological and organizational revolution in the workplace. The massive re-organization of work processes – from information technology to agile production to the virtual workplace, from Quality of Working Life (QWL) to Total Quality Management (TQM) to International Standards Organization (ISO) – has prompted union members and working people to want more training to keep up with the changing needs in the workplace. In skilled crafts in the past, once one had completed an apprenticeship that skill set was generally secure. Due to constant changes in many areas, today that is no longer possible in many trades.¹⁵

B. Changes to the Training, Education and Employment Services Regime

1. Downsizing, cuts and changes to public sector delivery

On the one hand, union interest in training came about because governments and employers in the 1980s touted training as the panacea for all that ailed Canadian economy. A whole elaborate network of institutions, from the national CLFDB (Canadian Labour Force Development Board) to the CLMPC (Canadian Labour Market Productivity Centre), to provincial training and adjustment boards to sectoral councils, was set up from the 1980s onward. Training was a key goal of all of these institutions and many asked for and actively sought union participation and even granted virtual codetermination in some cases.¹⁶

At the same time as this new training regime was being created, the public sector was being undermined. Finally even the scaffolding of the new system was dismantled as the federal government devolved and withdrew ending national policy! Leaving us with an incredible mess!

But rather than end the already whetted union appetite for training, the new interest of unions became to engage in training to counter the cuts and shrinkage in the public education and employment sector. In other words, unions became concerned with the changes to the very services which are most needed by workers in this age of insecurity.

No clearer example could be seen than what happened to the public sector delivery of basic skills. NUPGE notes that “Adult Basic Education /Literacy and English as a Second Language/French as a Second Language programs, like all fundamental education programs in Canada were almost entirely delivered through public educational institutions with 100% public funding until just over decade ago.” Today this is no longer the case as many community and private institutions also deliver these programs.¹⁷

2. Devolution

If cuts to the public sector were not enough of an upheaval, recently these cuts have been delivered in a climate of massive re-organization and devolution of government responsibilities and involvement in training. All provinces except Ontario have now signed a Labour Market Development Agreement with the Human Resources Development Canada department of the federal government. They outline how previous federal programs would be delivered at the provincial level by the province, either alone or in a partnership with the federal government.

The devolution of the vast majority of federal training services to the provinces is often touted as part of the plan to give Quebec greater powers. The merits of this strategy, as far as Quebec is concerned, are valid, I believe, due to Quebec’s role in safeguarding the French language in North America. The CLC had already devolved education and training, as I have mentioned, to the Quebec labour movement in 1974! However, for the rest of

the country, the devolution, from federal government to the provincial governments and then, in some cases, from province to municipality, primarily serves as a smokescreen for cuts. It is also a rationale for the abandonment of the need for and the tools of a national training policy. In this sense, devolution helps entrench the rule of the market and the private sector as the natural arbitrator of training and employment services.¹⁸

At the same time, the federally sponsored Canadian Labour Force Development Board, a key part of a national strategy, has collapsed this year with the withdrawal of the business sector. In many ways, this collapse is only the natural follow-up to the federal government's devolution of training policy.¹⁹

3. Privatization and Commercialization

Other policies have accompanied cuts and devolution. In Canada, as throughout many other industrial societies, there has been a move towards massive privatization and commercialization of many programs. Commercialization involves attaching a fee to previously free programs (such as the proposed fees for apprenticeship programs in Ontario) or dramatically raising fees (as in the case of university and college education in Ontario). It has now made many public programs beyond the reach of many union members and working people, unless they have a good tuition refund program.²⁰

Many colleges and universities have themselves embarked on commercialization of their services as a means of responding to government cuts to programs. One can only note the growth of endowed chairs by major corporations in areas of their research interests, the proliferation of advertising on campus, and the development of costly business programs such as MBA which charge record tuition.

An emphasis on individualized funding of education and training, through savings plans such as the RESPs or loans and voucher systems, has also sought to turn education and training from a right to a marketable commodity, such as cars or houses. These individual programs also favour the upper middle class which alone has the potential for saving large sums of money.²¹ At the federal government level, and in most provinces, training seems to be headed to governance by a market driven law of the jungle (although this is probably too critical of natural law!) for how we articulate public policy on training.

The touting of training as a panacea the building of new institutions and their collapse as all occurred in a very short time frame. A recent CAW document indicates that "Training has been one of the shortest lived public policy initiatives in Canada."²²

In this context of general government downsizing and abandonment of an overall policy, as well as of increased privatization and commercialization, it is no wonder that many unions have become concerned as to how to continue to deliver training and employment services to their members.

C. Union Building

A more educated and demanding membership

As a last factor, I would like to mention the pressures on unions due to rising levels of education and a more demanding membership. Due to the relative success and extension of public education in the post war period, unions have more and more educated members who are demanding the right to lifelong learning and who want to go beyond their existing levels of education. At the same time, the higher levels of education of the workforce only bring into greater relief the situation of many workers who have not completed their secondary education. In the past these workers were often able to obtain job security but are now threatened with job loss or the inability to advance or find another job if they do not have more education and training. Union members have seen the advance of unions into many new areas, from more complete pensions to legal aid to sophisticated medical and dental benefit plans. Training seems to many another legitimate issue about which unions should develop policies and demands.

“Who can I turn to, when you turn away?” Anthony Newley

It is this confluence of factors, which has led workers and union members to demand more training, education and employment services. Why did many unions take up training rather than simply unions use the public system? Anthony Newley who died recently had a well-known hit of the sixties: it asked the question “Who can I turn to, when you turn away?” In Canada, the federal state has turned and walked away (some people might prefer run away!) from training. Other levels of governments starting with the provinces may be still there, but to use the same metaphor, may not have walked away but are in hiding!

The first major consequence of destatization (the transfer of programs from all levels of government to private, for-profit or a community, non-profit providers) and privatization of training programs has been a huge growth in the role of for-profit training and services. HRDC, for example, has made a point of devolving many of its services to private for profit sector firms. The Ontario the Ministry of Education and Training maintains a list of some 400 registered private vocational; schools on its webpage.²³ While there is no accurate recent overall data, we know that in 1993 only some 34 % of all adult training was provided by the public system, 20% was provided by commercial suppliers, 21% by employers and 25% by other providers.²⁴ This rise of private training can also be facilitated through computers and the Internet as training programs can be offered on disk and into virtual classrooms. When it comes to the delivery of employer sponsored training, the public educational sector shrunk to only 21%; the employers 35%; the commercial sector 32%; and others (including unions) only 12%.

So in a much smaller way then, the development of a not-for-profit training sector composed of community organizations as well as unions and union sponsored training bodies has been part of the re-organization of training process. But much of this growth, in the case of unions, is simply building on training, as in the case of construction trade

unions, which has existed for the last hundred and fifty years. Some of the newer bodies may seem large, such as some of the new union training centres, but the numbers of these remain very, very small compared to the numbers employed in public colleges and board of education or in the for-profit sector.

Most unions in the private and public sector have no or very embryonic resources deployed in training and employment services. One major Canadian public sector union has only very recently hired even one national training person. This is not to say that union programs are not an important factor in a particular location, particular trades or sectors, or at a particular time. Nor is it to say that a pattern or trend to develop union-only delivery mechanisms without linkages to the public sector could in the end create a large third sector which might indeed pose a threat to public training's survival. In this sense, we are at a crucial time when new patterns of training are emerging and so I believe it is particularly important to begin to examine this issue.

We are in a situation today where more and more unions are and will be bargaining training over the next period of time. As public funds are cut back unions and their collective agreements may very well control increasingly important parts of the overall training budget. It is key to determine how these new programs will work and interact with the public sector.

At the same time, the main danger to the public system is clearly the proliferation of for-profit training. It is for profit training that poses the real and constant threat to the public system. The expansion of private colleges, even private universities in BC, charter schools (as in Alberta) and private vocational schools and trainers seem to pose a real threat to the public system.

While these are all the external pressures that have forced unions to offer more training, education and employment services, and to bargain for more of these services, there are also internal reasons. Union building is one important reason. Because their members want and need these programs unions have seen their involvement as a strategic tool to reach out to old, new and potential members.

Some aspects of education and training also offer a direct way for the union to develop education around union values and principles, what the AFL-CIO calls "worker centred" or labour-focused training. This attempt by many unions to insert a union content into training such as a basic skills program is not done in a vacuum. Unions know that if they do not attempt to influence the content of the training and educational programs, in many cases the training will still exist but it will be an employer program with business values which will fill the training needs vacuum. In this sense, the need to develop and participate in the training agenda can be in some cases a competitive exercise with employers as to who can control the training agenda. The CAW for example has recently developed a new training program for new members, which is part of a joint training project in the auto sector.²⁵

Most union run or joint programs have come about as a result of either negotiating with employers or through government grants. As government and public sector funding has dried up in recent years, more and more unions have begun to negotiate programs with employers. The different kinds of programs range from training trust funds to hours of training per member.²⁶ Most of these programs involve some kind of jointly controlled training. The Labourers' Union has many centres developed on this basis. Amongst these programs is the CAW's joint auto training fund negotiated with the big three auto companies. In the stand-alone category, UFCW has built a string of training centres across Canada financed from negotiated training trust funds, which are entirely controlled by the union.

As governments have withdrawn from comprehensive funding of many aspects of training, many governments have established funds to try, I would suggest, to involve other levels of society – from unions to community organizations to sectoral councils, to universities – to set up (or at least to research setting up) training programs. For example, the National Literacy Secretariat has funded research or pilot literacy programs in many different levels of society.²⁷

It would also be remiss not to mention the training done through the bipartite and tripartite training and sectoral bodies established at the end of the eighties. The federal government and a number of provincial governments, like Saskatchewan, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, have established various forms of boards. These are usually of a bipartite, tri-partite or multipartite nature.²⁸ They were established to have some role in examining and coordinating training needs, whether at a national (CFLDB), provincial (Saskatchewan Labour Force Development Board) or local (Local Training Boards in Ontario) levels.²⁹

Sectoral councils (in which unions participate) have also been given the task of developing training programs for their industrial sector. Foremost here would be the example already mentioned of the steel industry: the joint CSTEAC organization which has developed an excellent comprehensive training program in the steel industry which has been developed in a joint union employer manner.

However, much of this latter avenue for union involvement has proved difficult if not impossible. The federal and provincial governments with few exceptions cut off all but marginal funding to these bipartite and tripartite bodies, leading to the closure or commercialization of many. At the same time, the federal government's withdrawal from training policy has led to the collapse of federal institutions such as the CLFDB. Finally provincial government have also sought to close provincial boards (Ontario) or attempt to limit their powers (Quebec).³⁰

PUBLIC SECTOR UNIONS REACT

As important as finding out why unions have become interested in training it is equally important to understand why public sector unions have become concerned with this issue in recent years.

Over the past 15 years or so, public sector union members in the government delivery of training services or in the education area have been hit by massive layoffs and budget cuts. These cuts have been motivated by the ideological thrust of the new right to downsize and finally eliminate the public sector's role in the economy. At the same time, this philosophy is aimed at eliminating the very notion of a genuine social safety net or of a general public education system.³¹ Many other governments shared at least the idea that balanced budget and deficit and debt elimination must take priority above public services and social programs.

Many in the educational sector unions perceived the growth of union training programs as part of the growth of the broader non-public or private sector and the decline of the public sector. The same view has been shared by many of the unions involved in delivery of employment services. The devolution of federal services seems to have made the situation more complicated particularly as the fate of Ontario is not yet determined as to the form devolution will take. Unions in the public sector are thus rightly concerned with job security as a result of privatization and destatization.

But, as unions in the public sector in the same way as all of the union movement, they are also concerned with preserving and strengthening public services and institutions.³² The public education sector has certain core values such as accessibility, universality, affordability. What public education unions like to emphasize as far as how these principles impact the delivery question is that access is open to all independently of whether one is a union member or not or independently of how well off a particular union is. There are also other democratic benefits to public services such as the potential for public accountability, control and scrutiny. Once training and employment services pass to the non-public sector, even to unions, much of that potential for public review can be lost.

The public sector unions were not only concerned with the actual development of training delivery but rather with the potential for the development of a large "third" system in the future. This could occur if most unions were to negotiate and undertake training on the basis of isolation from the public system. On the other hand, as funding for the public system declines, the power of unions to negotiate training could become one of the major means of securing new sources of training funding for the public sector. This is why a protocol on training they felt was essential.

Part III: What is in the Protocol?

The CLC Protocol tries to deal with a difficult and complicated issue and like any such document it was the fruit of compromise and consensus between many unions. There are undoubtedly those whose views will not be fully reflected in this document.

Let us look at some of the most important points of the Protocol (see Appendix). The Protocol contains a statement of educational and training rights which is the most comprehensive to date. It includes the adoption of a position in favour of free apprenticeship, college and university education, and employment services. In this sense, CLC policy goes beyond even the best provincial government or major opposition party policy to freeze cutbacks or limit increases in fees.

The Protocol also reaffirms the principle that primary responsibility for the funding of education, training and employment services rests with government, not employers. It also asserts that the federal government should have “the main role in the training and employment services sector and should not abandon its responsibilities in this area.”

Significantly, the Protocol reaffirms the belief that “public institutions should be the primary deliverer and preferred means of training, education and employment services.” At the same time it breaks new ground by opposing “private-for-profit education, training and employment services.” It then goes further to say that “these kinds of services will not, except in extreme exceptional circumstances where there is no alternative, be used by the labour movement.” This clearly recognizes that unions will make their best effort to apply this section.

But what about the major issue in terms of the attitude to the not-for-profit union and community training and education sector? The Protocol affirms their right to exist but they must “enhance and not duplicate public programs and services already in place. Labour-sponsored or joint programs can create new opportunities for working people to gain access to education, training or employment services that would otherwise have been denied to them.” In this sense, the Protocol affirms the primacy of the public but also indicates that there is a clear role for the union sector if it is able to enhance or complement the public sector.

If the Protocol sets limits on the role of union or joint programs, then, it also attempts to influence the relationship of the public sector education system to the labour movement. “Labour wants the public education system to become more responsive to the values and needs of working people.” It criticizes institutions such as “community colleges, which were founded as institutions to be close to working communities, have often grown more distant and less attuned to the requirements of working people and more open to the pressures of corporations and businesses.” It calls for a democratization of the public institutions and a real role for labour, parity with business on all college and university boards. It also articulates the need to elect labour to boards of education and to influence public policy on this issue.

Mechanisms for dealing with issue

The heart of the Protocol is the mechanism for dealing with and for avoiding potential problems on this issue arising between unions. The first mechanism proposed is information. The Protocol puts the responsibility on unions or central labour bodies “which are negotiating or have established employment services and/or training or educational programs, to inform the relevant public sector union(s), the CLC, the provincial federation and the local labour council(s).”

After the phase of information there is the phase of linkage. It is not enough to inform the unions concerned but to set up “**formal national, provincial, regional or local links** with the public sector union(s) concerned.” All of these links are there to open permanent lines of communication. It is recommended that the conclusions should be contained in a **project start-up protocol** between the unions concerned. The protocol would also hope to draw public sector unions into the discussions between a public sector institution and the unions concerned as well as emphasize the need for public sector unions to inform the other unions of changes in these services that may affect them.

In the sections on the content and form of the programs, the Protocol notes the need for unions to “work to ensure” the delivery of programs by unionized public sector institutions. This implies that a priority will be placed on looking for public sector institutions to deliver the training. At the same time the Protocol assures the need for “peer” or union educators who, along with professional educators, can often play a crucial role in labour training and education programs. This recognition of peer educators on the part of public sector unions has been a crucial point for some unions.

On the content of public programs it is affirmed that labour needs to play a “codetermining” role in the development of curricula in general. The Protocol also calls for programs to have greater labour content, Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition, portability, and flexibility in terms of delivery. Labour programs also agree to pay their workers equal salaries and work towards unionization of their own employees.

The last part of the Protocol is concerned with dispute resolution and monitoring. To many in the public sector unions, this was the most crucial part of the Protocol. If there were no mechanism for dispute resolution, the rest would remain pious wishes. It is to this end that the Protocol sets up a permanent training protocol sub-committee of the CLC Training and Technology Committee to monitor the issues raised by the Protocol. The sub-committee has equal representation from unions involved in labour and joint programs and concerned public sector unions. The sub committee will issue an annual report on the subject. If this mechanism cannot solve the dispute, the CLC Officer responsible for training issues “will mediate or appoint a mediator for all disputes.” The final stage for any dispute would be for resolution at the CLC Executive Council.

Part IV Conclusions: New Initiatives

It is much too early to write the history of the use of or the effects of the Protocol in the labour movement. However, it is important to note that some effects have already been felt in a growing awareness of the issue. We can highlight programs that have developed a public-private partnership. The example of CSTECH has already been cited. Some programs like the CAW-McMaster Labour Certificate program have been formed as a joint partnership between a public institution and a union to develop and deliver educational services. In BC, the Joint Union Management Program of the CEP and employers in the forest industry now trains peer educators in its Learning and Education Assisted by Peers (LEAP) basic skills program at a community college with college educators supervising the quality of the program. In other cases, such as in BC, a new training protocol has been signed between the government and public sector education unions (the College Institute Educators Association and British Columbia Government and Service Employees Union). It assures the primacy of government funds for training going to the public institutions while preserving a role for community trainers.³³

The Future

Does the approval of the Protocol mean there will be no further major problems around this issue? Only time will tell. However, the CLC adoption of the Protocol has at last assured that Canadian unions have a solid framework for dealing with this important and potentially divisive issue. The Protocol could even be a model for potential provincial and sector training protocols. The Protocol might also act as an educational tool to engage union members in discussions on the direction of training, education and employment services in Canada and on what role unions should play in that crucial debate. Some unions have already done internal education on these issues using the Protocol.

Perhaps as well, the protocol could open up some new directions for the CLC. The role of the CLC and central federative structures has been changing and evolving in the last period. In the past, one of their key roles was to legislate and rule on the boundaries for union organization between affiliates. Today, many of the larger unions are becoming general unions, organizing in many sectors, often in the private and public domain. Perhaps brokering protocols on many other issues will be a new role for the CLC.

The protocol might also signal a new or renewed national role for the CLC outside the union movement on these issues. As the national training regime crumbles, there are few national institutions left to pick up the slack. One of the few, and best placed institutions, remaining to help develop and battle for national policies and processes is the Canadian labour movement. It can stand up for working people and develop a clear national agenda on these issues. In this sense, the Protocol may not be the last of policy documents on training but the start of a new and crucial role for the Canadian union movement on developing and helping to shape the Canada wide training environment for the next century.

NOTES

¹ The UFCW (United Food and Commercial Workers Union) calls these “foundation skills” programs.

² The largest union-run centre is the Metro Labour Education Centre attached to the Toronto and York Region Labour Council.

³ These concerns were raised at the 1997 CLC Training Conference.

⁴ At that time limiting them to 4 years. See Eugene Forsey, *Trade Unions in Canada*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1982, p.18.

⁵ “Canadian Labour Congress Policy Statement on Training and Unemployment Insurance”, Canadian Labour Congress, Ottawa, 1992.

⁶ See John Anderson, *A Labour Agenda on Training Funding*, Training Matters Working Paper Series #98-01, Centre for Research on Work and Society, York University, North York, 1998.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ See Chris Schenk and John Anderson (eds.), “Introduction,” *Reshaping Work 2*, Garamond Press, Toronto, 1999.

⁹ Bruce Campbell, Maria Teresa Gutierrez Haces, Andrew Jackson, Mehrene Larudee and Matthew Sanger, *Pulling Apart: The Deterioration of Employment and Income in North America Under Free Trade*, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, Ottawa, 1999. Notes Bruce Campbell: “Manufacturing employment, stable throughout the 1980s, experienced a 13% decline that, despite the improvement in the manufactures trade balance, was three times the drop in US levels. The clothing, textiles, leather, furniture, paper products, and primary metals sectors were particularly hard hit, losing between 20% and 40% of their work force. But so too were “winning sectors” like electronics which lost one-quarter of its employment base. Meanwhile employment in maquiladora export processing zones on the US-Mexico border exploded by 116% in the first six years of free trade.” Bruce Campbell, “Taking stock of free trade: Ten years after the implementation of the FTA, the “benefits” are hard to see.” Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, December 31, 1998: <http://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/comment2.html>

¹⁰ Lester Thurow, “Building Wealth: The New Rules for Individuals, Companies and Nations, *Atlantic Monthly*, June 1999

¹¹ Nancy Weil, “Microsoft Tops GE to Become World’s Most Valuable Company,” IDG News Service, Boston Bureau: <http://www.lti.on.ca/webworld/0917gm02.htm>, Sept. 16, 1998 16:32 GMT; CNN, “Experts on Internet stocks: Market watchers voice concerns over skyrocketing share prices of ‘Net stocks,” CNN Financial Network: <http://www.cnnfn.com/digitaljam/9901/12/experts/> January 12, 1999: 12:47 p.m. ET.

¹² In 1998, his peers in Canada elected him as the CEO of the Year: <http://www.cn.ca/cn/english/news/corporate/tellier.html>

¹³ Andrew Jackson, “A Banner Year for Job Creation?”, Canadian Labour Congress, Ottawa, January, 1999.

¹⁴ Trade Union Congress, “Individual Learning Accounts”, March 1999: <http://www.tuc.org.uk/vbuilding/tuc/browse/object.exe?0&0&0&1>. For the USA, see the training account provisions in the Workforce Investment Act (1998): <http://usworkforce.org/act.htm>.

¹⁵ See Chris Schenk and John Anderson (eds.), "Introduction," *Re-Shaping Work 2*, Garamond Press, Toronto, 1999.

¹⁶ This is not universal however: many sectoral councils have no or marginal union representation.

¹⁷ "Public Basic Skills," *NUPGE Research Position Papers*, National Union of Public and Government Employees, Ottawa, April, 1999.

¹⁸ In interviews conducted with Ontario civil servants for *A Labour Training Agenda*, I found that one of the reasons that successive Ontario provincial governments have been wary of signing any kind of devolution with Ottawa has been their fear that devolution would mean less money to carry out the same services.

¹⁹ "Canadian Labour Force Development Board to cease operations," *CFLDB Infobox*, Canadian Labour Force Development Board, Ottawa, Feb. 26, 1999.

²⁰ Few unions have a good tuition refund program. The auto sector of the CAW is an exception. But a recent autoworkers' survey, showed only some 2-3% of respondents have used this program.

²¹ The federal Registered Education Savings Plan now rewards savings of \$2000 a year with a \$400 government grant per year. But how many can put away that amount per year per child?

²² Canadian Auto Workers, "Past Gains, Future Challenges: Bargaining for a New Millenium," Canadian Auto Workers, Toronto, 1999, p. 61

²³ See the Ontario Ministry of Education website: <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/list/pvs.html>

²⁴ Human Resources Development Canada, *Adult Education and Training in Canada*, Human Resources Development Canada, Ottawa, 1994, p.62. "Other" includes everyone from community centres and sports centres to professional associations, unions and private tutors and trainers.

²⁵ This program was negotiated in the 1996 round of collective bargaining with the Big Three.

²⁶ John Anderson, *A Labour Agenda on Training Funding*, Training Matters Working Paper Series #98-01, Centre for Research on Work and Society, York University, North York, 1998.

²⁷ For a detailed account of NLS involvement see John Anderson, "Getting the Money", Canadian Labour Congress, Ottawa, 1998.

²⁸ Bi-partite institutions like sectoral councils involve unions and employers; tri-partite bodies include unions, employers and governments; multipartite agencies also include equity groups, as with the now-defunct CFLDB.

²⁹ For a detailed exposition of these boards see John Anderson, *A Labour Agenda for Training Funding*, Training Matters Working Paper Series #98-01, Centre for Research on Work and Society, York University, North York, 1998.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ See the Fraser Institute's website where they advertize for the "Market solution to everything."

³² NUPGE, "Post Secondary Public Education", *NUPGE Research Position Papers*, National Union of Public and Government Employees, Ottawa, 1999.

³³ Information on the BC Training Accord can be found at the College Institute Educators' Association (CIEA) site: <http://www.vcn.bc.ca/ciea/bri-tacc.htm>. The accord itself is available at www.aspect.bc.ca/accord/html. The following is from the CIEA briefing "Unions representing educators in the college sector have agreed to work with the institutions in responding to the government as a client: Unions have agreed to be flexible in providing training services for government. This might include such things as off-site delivery of training, flexible scheduling and hours, and regional delivery. Unions have agreed to support the institutions in developing new programs, curriculum and approaches to meet the training needs of government. Unions have agreed to assist the institutions in ensuring that the government receives the best value for its training expenditures. They will also work to remove barriers to providing training for government in the regions." Many non-profit trainers have asked for clarification of the accord and the role that they will have in the future vis-a-vis the Accord. This information can be found in the news releases of AMSSA (Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Service Agencies) of British Columbia: at UPDATES, 99/03/05 "Social Service Reps Meet with Deputy Minister on Training Accord" and 98/11/26 "Petter Offers to Work with Community Groups on Training Accord" at <http://www.amssa.org/update/>

Credits and Thanks

In the course of preparing the Protocol, I worked with literally dozens of CLC affiliate representatives including all the members and staff of the CLC Training and Technology Committee. I would like to thank them all very much, especially Jean Claude Parrot and Kevin Hayes, and particularly all those members who went out of their way to furnish edits and suggestions.

I would also like to thank all those whom I interviewed or contacted more recently for the paper.

Jorge Garcia, United Food and Commercial Workers
Victor Carrozino, United Food and Commercial Workers
Kevin Hayes, Canadian Labour Congress
Paddy Musson, Ontario Public Services Employees Union
Natalie St. Louis, National Union Public and General Employees
Ed Brown, Newfoundland Association of Public Employees
Jim Dixon, Communications Energy and Paperworkers
Laurell Ritchie, Canadian AutoWorkers
Pat MacDonnell, Manitoba Government Employees Union
Gord Falconer, United Steel Workers of America
Paul Inksetter, Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation

I would also like to thank the Labour Education and Training Research Network and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their financial support for this project.

Appendix

**CLC PROTOCOL
ON THE DELIVERY
OF TRAINING,
EDUCATION
AND
EMPLOYMENT SERVICES**

Approved
by
CLC Executive Council
June 1998

CLC PROTOCOL ON THE DELIVERY OF TRAINING, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(I) THE NEED FOR A PROTOCOL

- 1.1** To deal with the growth of union-sponsored and joint labour-employer delivered training, education and employment services (hereafter referred to as labour or joint programs) it has become clear that we need **a protocol between the unions involved in these programs and the public sector unions** which traditionally and currently provide these services.
- 1.2** The aim of this protocol is to **identify, clarify roles, establish procedures and set up mechanisms for dialogue and dispute resolution.** ⁱ

TRAINING, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES ARE IN UPHEAVAL

- 2.1** We are living in a period of **continuing economic hardship** with high permanent levels of unemployment as well as layoffs and the threat of job cuts in many sectors.
- 2.2** We are also experiencing **deepening cutbacks** to some of the very public sector services in training, education and employment that are most needed by working people in this age of insecurity.
- 2.3** At the same time, working people are faced with the fall-out from the re-organization of government responsibilities and involvement in training. First and most importantly, the federal government will soon

have completed the transfer or **devolution** of the vast majority of its **training services** to the provinces.ⁱⁱ Some provinces are also involved in devolving training and employment responsibilities to the municipal level.

2.4 Governments have been involved in a **massive privatization and commercialization** of many programs. For-profit and non-profit trainers have been awarded a growing share of training and employment services, previously delivered by the public sector.

2.5 Governments have also been promoting payment for many previously free programs such as apprenticeship training and the individualized funding of education through loans and voucher systems.

(3) UNIONS MORE INVOLVED IN ALL ASPECTS OF TRAINING, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

What unions are doing

3.1 Unions are **more and more involved with training, education and employment services**. In recent years, dozens of new initiatives in areas such as basic skills, skills training apprenticeship, adult education and employment services have been started and many more are in the planning stages.

3.2 Unions have always had their own **union-focused training and education programs** for their members such as stewards' courses, health and safety courses, and programs on the history and values of the labour movement. This protocol does not concern these programs.

3.3 What are examined here are other **training and education programs** such as basic skill education, apprenticeship, skills upgrading, adult education, and college or university courses. These programs are

either jointly administered with the employer or administered by unions on their own.

- 3.4** As well, more and more unions are participating in the development of **labour/community-based employment resource centres**. These centres are now providing some of the services once handled, mainly, by the federal HRDC offices, and, to a lesser extent, by community colleges or provincial services, or now, as a result of devolution, by provincial or municipal organizations.

How unions have increased their participation

- 3.5** In many cases, unions have increased their participation in training and education through the **collective bargaining process by negotiating** union controlled or co-determined programs. Training, education and employment services have become major issues for negotiations with employers. Union training trust funds, payment for adult education at the college or university level, basic skills and apprenticeship programs have all been the subjects of negotiations in recent years.
- 3.6** In other cases, unions have **negotiated with different levels of governments** to provide for funding of labour/community employment centres or programs.
- 3.7** Unions have also become more active in participating on various **bipartite or tripartite boards, committees and other bodies** dealing, all or in part, with training issues such as adjustment committees, sectoral and development boards.

Why unions are becoming more involved

3.8 Union members are demanding the **right to life-long learning opportunities** to gain basic skills, to continuously upgrade their knowledge and to develop their education to its fullest potential.

On the one hand, Canadian union members, and working people in general, are more skilled and better educated than ever before, in large measure due to the public education system. They want the chance to go beyond their initial schooling and training.

On the other hand, while most working people today have the chance to complete their secondary education, there are still many in the workplace who have never had the opportunity to obtain basic skills, such as literacy and numeracy. They want that right now.

3.9 Union members and working people want access to many services that are no longer available or more difficult to obtain (due to **cuts to funding and services**) as well as access to needed new programs that have yet to be created. As well, the effects of the **free trade agreements**, and the consequent loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, have created a demand for many of these services which the existing under-funded public sector was, and is, unable to meet.

3.10 Union members and working people want **more training and employment services, to keep up with the changing needs in the workplace**, such as the constant thrust of **work re-organization** and the continuous introduction of **new technology**, and to prepare for new jobs or careers if they are laid-off. Older workers, immigrant workers or workers with little formal education and training are often particularly threatened by these changes.

3.11 Unions view their involvement in training, educational and employment services as **a strategic tool** to reach out to members and potential members and **to build and strengthen the union movement**. Through these programs, unions can involve new and

existing members in participating in union activities and learning about the role and vision of the labour movement.

3.12 Unions have tried to use their participation in education, training and employment services as a chance to **develop and emphasize worker-centered policies** and programs in these fields.

3.13 Unions have also seen their involvement as crucial to **strengthening and lobbying for public sector programs** in these areas as the public sector comes increasingly under attack.

(4) PUBLIC SECTOR UNIONS FACE THREATS TO PROGRAMS AND JOBS

4.1 At the same time, some of the very same factors, which have led many unions to become more involved in training, education and employment services, have resulted in **devastating cutbacks to public sector** jobs and programs.

4.2 Community college education workersⁱⁱⁱ, public elementary, and high school **education workers have been hard hit with layoffs** and the privatization of many aspects of training. Education workers in many provinces are also threatened with losing thousands of positions in the future.

4.3 Faced with this situation, education workers want to be assured that any **new labour or joint programs will not contribute to the cancellation of existing programs**, the loss of even more jobs and the weakening of the public sector institutions.

4.4 In employment services, members of federal government unions have been hit with **layoffs and with devolution of these services** to the provinces. At the provincial level, layoffs have been combined with

the devolution of some services to the municipal level. Many programs have also been handed over to private-for-profit deliverers.

- 4.5 **New technologies** employed in the delivery of many employment services are also contributing to job losses as computers and the Internet are used to deliver services.
- 4.6 Public sector unions are concerned with the **impact of labour or joint programs on jobs in HRDC** as well as on jobs at other levels of government.
- 4.7 The concerns of public sector unions go beyond job security. They are concerned with **preserving and strengthening public services and institutions**. They are concerned with promoting the core values of the public sector such as **accessibility, affordability, and other egalitarian socio-economic benefits**, as well as the democratic benefits that come from the fact that public services, unlike private services, remain subject to **public accountability, control and scrutiny**.

(5) GENERAL PRINCIPLES ON TRAINING, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

- 5.1 We believe all residents of Canada are entitled to the right to public education and training in one of Canada's two official languages; this includes the **right to free public education from K-12; free basic adult education, including the right to a secondary education and basic skills and second language education for new Canadians; free apprenticeship training; and free college and university education**.
- 5.2 We believe all residents of Canada are entitled to the **right to public, accessible and high quality employment services** including

unemployment insurance, welfare (without workfare), employment counseling and other adjustment services.

- 5.3** Unions will fight to ensure that rights to public education, training and employment services are **universal**, that is, **accessible to all**, regardless of factors such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, disabilities, sexual orientation, financial circumstance, work situation or citizenship status and that they are **transferable and portable across Canada** — including the recognition of foreign credentials.
- 5.4** The **primary responsibility for the funding of education**, training and employment services must remain with governments.
- 5.5** We believe the **federal government should have the main role in the training and employment services sector** and should not abandon its responsibilities in this area.
- 5.6** We believe that **public institutions should be the primary deliverer and preferred means of training, education and employment services**. Funds must be made available to ensure the continuing strength of public education institutions and government programs in these areas.
- 5.7** We are **opposed to private-for-profit education, training and employment services** and these kinds of services will not, except in extreme exceptional circumstances where there is no alternative, be used by the labour movement.
- 5.8** All labour-sponsored or joint programs or initiatives in terms of training, education labour/community centres must **enhance and not duplicate public programs and services already in place**. Labour-sponsored or joint programs can create new opportunities for working people to gain access to education, training or employment services that would otherwise have been denied to them.

- 5.9** CLC affiliates have and will continue to **oppose any privatization of existing public programs** or services and will seek to expand the scope of the public sector.
- 5.10** Labour wants the public education system to become **more responsive to the values and needs of working people**. For example, many community colleges, which were founded as institutions to be close to working communities, have often grown more distant and less attuned to the requirements of working people and more open to the pressures of corporations and businesses. In some instances, labour has been successful in forcing public institutions to be more responsive, and these examples should be studied and expanded upon.
- 5.11** Workers and their unions must play **a central role in working with public educators in determining the direction of training and education**. This means entrenching labour's views in public policy, as well as requiring labour-business parity on boards and committees concerned with training, and seats for labour on all college and university boards.
- 5.12** All affiliates will **fight to elect or appoint progressive labour candidates to the boards of education, of community colleges, of universities, and to curriculum/course advisory boards**.
- 5.13** Labour will use existing (or attempt to set up) **mechanisms for dialogue and discussion with government-delivered employment or training services** on a local, regional or national level.

(6) INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION AND LINKS

6.1 Unions or central labour bodies which are negotiating or have established employment services and/or training or educational programs, have the initial responsibility to **inform the relevant public sector union(s), the CLC, the provincial federation and the local labour council(s).**

6.2 The unions or central labour bodies involved in the delivery of labour or joint programs will then establish **formal national, provincial, regional or local links** with the public sector union(s) concerned.

These **links should be set up prior to the launching of any new program** and should continue for the length of the program. One of the first steps in this process should be a meeting between the parties concerned. Unions with existing programs should establish a link if they have not already done so. Links could then range from establishing regular lines of communication, to regular meetings, to establishing a joint committee.

6.3 At the developmental stage of the proposal, the parties concerned should clarify the aim of the project, any potential duplication of services, the needs of labour and the community, and the respective roles of the various unions in the project. This should be contained in a **project start-up protocol** between the unions proceeding on a new venture and the public sector union(s) concerned.

6.4 Unions or central labour bodies launching a new program will seek to involve **the concerned public sector unions as well as the relevant public sector institution(s) in the preparation of any agreement** on the delivery of employment services training or educational program. For example, in negotiating an agreement between a union and a community college on the provision of services, the concerned college education workers' union(s) should be brought into the process.

6.5 Public sector unions will keep the relevant labour bodies and unions informed of **changes in the employment services, training and education sectors** that are having, or will have, a negative or potentially negative impact on present or future members.

(7) CONTENT AND FORM OF PROGRAMS

7.1 Labour unions and joint labour programs will work to ensure that **unionized public sector institutions** are used to deliver labour-sponsored or joint training, education or employment services.

7.2 Education unions recognize that **peer learning and teaching are important parts** of many union training and education programs. Peer educators will often play a vital role in labour training and education programs. They are an important complement to qualified educators.

7.3 Labour and education sector unions agree to promote a **co-determined role for labour in the shaping and development of all curriculums** used in all labour or joint programs. In some instances, this may mean negotiating a curriculum between the union, management, public sector institution and public sector union.

7.4 Labour and education sector unions will work to gain **credit recognition and portability for union programs** in public sector institutions, such as community colleges and universities, as well as the transferability of credits between institutions in different provinces. Labour and education unions recognize the need to develop and facilitate the implementation of proper **prior learning and assessment recognition** programs which allow union members to receive credit for their learning, training and experience which can then be used to access public education programs.

7.5 Labour and education unions will jointly press **for public sector institutions to be responsive** in terms of the content requirements for union programs. In other words, unions want to be assured that the content of programs and courses is attuned to the needs of labour, its history and its values.

7.6 Labour also wants **greater flexibility in terms of when and where courses and services are given**, so that workers can get the training and education and employment services they need, when and where they need it. Public sector unions support this need and will continue to press for these kinds of changes with their employers. Business has already in many cases been granted this kind of flexibility.

Labour wants courses to be delivered in the workplace or in the union hall and to start up when needed. For example, unemployed union members need a training or adjustment program to start as soon as they are laid off. Unemployed workers cannot wait for the next semester. They want services delivered at the workplace not in some distant location.

(8) WORKING CONDITIONS AND UNIONIZATION

8.1 Labour will attempt to negotiate to pay **wages and benefits for workers in labour or joint programs that are at least equal to those paid in similar positions in the public sector and which recognize employment equity principles.**

8.2 Labour will **encourage the unionization** of employees in these programs.

(9) DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND MONITORING

9.1 A permanent training protocol sub-committee of the CLC Training and Technology Committee will be established to **monitor** the relationship between unions on the issues contained in this protocol. The sub-committee will have **equal representation** from both unions involved in labour and joint programs and concerned public sector unions. This committee will act as a resource and a **repository of information** on all labour-sponsored or joint labour-management programs in these areas. The sub-committee will prepare **an annual report** on this issue (including the status of any disputes and resolutions) for the Training and Technology Committee of the CLC.

9.2 The CLC will act as a mediator in cases of disputes that cannot be resolved through discussions between the parties. The CLC Officer responsible for training issues will mediate or appoint a mediator for all disputes. The mediator will make a recommendation which, if not accepted, will be referred to the CLC Board for resolution.

(10) COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

10.1 Workshops or panel discussions on issues arising from this protocol will be part of the CLC training strategy.

10.2 The **CLC Newsletter** on training will publish regular information on the development of new programs.

ENDNOTES

i It is important to note that the issue here is not one of private versus public sector unions but rather of concern to any union (from the private or public sector) which is involved in a labour-sponsored or joint program and the public sector unions traditionally involved in the delivery of the particular public services.

In this document, training refers to basic skills, skills training and apprenticeship in the period after K-12. Education refers to adult education including continuing education, post-secondary education and all other workplace education. Employment services refers to labour adjustment services, training and employment counseling programs, job search services, help with Employment Insurance and other programs.

ii Only Ontario has not yet signed a deal on how this is to be accomplished.

3 The term "education worker" includes teachers and all other school staff.