

been worthwhile. On the whole employers had fewer remarks to make about training than they had about the placement function of the Division. The responses from the Boards of Trade indicated a large number of employers in those associations had never heard of the Industrial Training Program. Of those who had taken advantage of it a clear majority felt that it had been worthwhile.

Those who were critical both in their written responses and in testimony before the Committee concentrated their comments on two main problems—the selection of trainees, which must be done in cooperation with the Canada Manpower Centre, and the amount of what employers regarded as ‘red-tape’ in working out the details of the training contracts with the two levels of government involved.

Employers are told in the official literature put out by the Division promoting the Industrial Training Program;

The choice of trainees is up to you, since they are your employees. If, however, you have to hire new employees, it is the responsibility of the Canada Manpower Centre to check the training needs of the candidates and determine their eligibility.³

In practice, the range of payments directly relates to the type of trainee involved. In this way the Division exercises control over selection. Payment is withdrawn if the criteria for the training program is not adhered to. An employer mounting a program for those employees already on his payroll, who have been selected by him, receives the least amount of the financial assistance. Referrals from Canada Manpower Centres are required for the enrolment of unemployed or disadvantaged trainees.

Employers' views on the lack of sensitivity of Canada Manpower Centres to their particular needs have already been stated. Employers who complained of this aspect of the Industrial Training Program insisted that if they had more control over the choice of trainees there would be fewer drop-outs. Employers who shared the expense of mounting training courses resented the loss of their investment when trainees abandoned the course before completion.

The experience of one employer is relevant to the two main complaints of employers about training by Canada Manpower. Mr. M. R. Mallory testified that his company had sought training grants on one occasion in 1974.

The Canada Manpower representative proved most helpful in securing the necessary approvals for the training grants, even though it took two months to secure these approvals . . . we were totally unsuccessful in Canada Manpower sending us any referrals for trainee openings . . . we finally obtained the six trainees by using newspaper advertising.

We are presently running the same program again with other candidates. We made the assumption that . . . to repeat the same program would require only formal approval. Once more we were frustrated and decided to forego the grant system because of the exigencies of time for this second training program. (19:7)

The negotiations between an employer, Canada Manpower Centre, and the provincial authority can indeed be confusing for the employer and this has

³ Pamphlet: *Canada Manpower Industrial Training Program*, page 9.