

Relations industrielles Industrial Relations



Nos collaborateurs

Volume 3, Number 9, May 1948

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1023623ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1023623ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (print)

1703-8138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this document

(1948). Nos collaborateurs. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 3(9), 140–140. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1023623ar>

Tous droits réservés © Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval, 1948

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

The logo for Érudit, featuring the word 'Érudit' in a bold, red, sans-serif font.

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

3. There was reluctance on the part of many youths to be bound in advance for a fixed period of years without hope of more rapid advancement to skilled tradesman status, where earned by reason of superior effort and ability.
4. There was an understandable fear on the part of many youths or on the part of their parents or guardians that an apprenticeship might not always provide an all round training in all of the skills of the chosen trade, but only in some sections of that trade. For example, the apprentice carpenter might be employed on rough carpentry for the entire duration of his apprenticeship without ever being given an opportunity to learn anything about finished carpentry work.
5. Lastly, there was the disinclination of some parents or guardians to irrevocably bind a son or ward, as the case might be, to one specific employer for a fixed period of years.

Next to be considered was the position of organized labour in the scheme of things and here it was recognized that the primary concern of the labour unions would naturally always be to keep the ratio of apprentices to qualified tradesmen within reasonable predetermined limits in each and every trade.

Long consideration was then devoted to the need to promote apprenticeship training on a scale adequate to meet the unprecedented demands which would undoubtedly materialize in the post-war reconstruction era. It was obvious to the Committee that this large scale apprenticeship training could never be accomplished by relying exclusively on the long established system of indenturing the individual apprentice to the individual employer. In this connection, it was emphasized that because of the wide fluctuations in both the volume and the kinds of work carried out by the average building trades employer from time to time, it would be most illogical to expect the average employer to make permanent apprenticeship contract commitments greatly in excess of his average minimum year-round labour requirements. To cite what is perhaps a somewhat extreme example, take the case of a large general contractor who might occasionally have as many as 250 bricklayers on his payroll for a relatively short period of time, whereas he is unable to provide steady year-round permanent employment for more than an average of say 25 brick-

layers. Obviously this particular employer could not safely enter into formal apprenticeship contracts with more than the number of apprentices warranted on the basis of his year-round permanent average minimum of 25 bricklayer tradesmen, which automatically raised the question as to who would be expected to assume the responsibility of signing apprenticeship contracts with the apprentices attached to the other 225 bricklayer tradesmen who were temporarily on this employer's payroll for part of the year.

Taking all these things into consideration, it was finally the unanimous conclusion of the Special Committee that the large scale future building trades apprenticeship needs of the Province could be satisfactorily met only through the medium of co-operative action on the part of employer and employee organizations and the Provincial Department of Labour, in arranging for apprentices to be trained collectively, as wards of legally constituted Apprenticeship Commissions, with permanent training centres located at suitable places throughout the Province, each separate Centre being operated under the joint direction of local management and labour bodies, in conjunction with the local Building Trades Joint Committee. It was believed that his new large scale method of apprenticeship training could be introduced without in any way disrupting the long established method based on the indenturing of individual apprentices to individual employers.

The Brief, which was finally presented to Hon. Antonio Barrette, Minister of Labour at Quebec, on October 10th 1944, undoubtedly provided a large measure of inspiration for the Quebec Apprenticeship Assistance Act which was placed on the statutes in May 1945 and which — for all practical purposes — made possible the implementation of all of the different recommendations embodied in the Brief.

NOS COLLABORATEURS

CLEMENT, Marcel, licencié ès lettres, diplômé d'études supérieures de philosophie (Sorbonne), licencié en droit. Diplômé d'études supérieures d'économie politique (Faculté de droit de Paris), professeur à la Faculté des sciences sociales de Laval.

DION, Gérard, L.Th., L.Phil., M.Sc.Soc., secrétaire du Département des relations industrielles, de la Faculté des sciences sociales, Université Laval.

PRICE, J.L.E., M.E.I.C., président de J.L.E. Price & Co. Ltd., entrepreneur en construction, président du Centre d'Apprentissage des Métiers du Bâtiment de Montréal.