

*Manpower and Immigration Council*

construction and urban development offer striking illustrations—but which could have been anticipated through a more effective use of available information and prior study, or even averted through more timely and concerted public and private policies.

Constant, complete and early consultation is therefore essential among the three levels of government and the private sector if this new initiative or new approach is to be successful.

Therefore, with reference to this resolution the official opposition awaits the presentation of the bill and will seek out evidence of proper research, local involvement, ministerial responsibility, excessive costs, superfluous staff, and full consultation with every sector involved.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Chairman, we in this group welcome the resolution and the statement of the minister proposing to set up an advisory committee or committees to help him lay down policy in the fields of manpower and immigration. We welcome it because we have been proposing such a policy for a number of years, as have organizations such as the Canadian Labour Congress. We welcome it also because the minister certainly needs some advice and needs it very quickly. The fact is that the results we expected from the changes made in the manpower training program following the government's decision last year to abandon the technical and vocational training program and take over manpower training, which we predicted would lead to a very sharp reduction in the number of people being retrained, have come about.

I have some figures I wish to put on the record which are, to say the least, disturbing if not disastrous. These figures may surprise members of the house and the public in general but I am sure the minister knows them as well as I do. The situation is not only as bad as members of the opposition said months ago it would be, not only as bad as people working in the field for some of the cities and in the provincial departments of education said it would be; it is even worse.

A very good summary of the arguments for and against the changes which the minister introduced after a good deal of discussion is contained in two articles which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on April 22 of this year. The first article summarizes the objections of the government of Ontario and its department of education. It was written

by Barrie Zwicker. I will read a few of the points which Mr. Zwicker made:

The key points in the new regulations exclude from allowances any person under 17 and any single person over 17 with fewer than three years of working experience. Before April, everyone was eligible.

Among the persons who do not qualify are young dropouts (or graduates) who find in a year or two after leaving school that they have no marketable skill, childless widows who suddenly need to work...

Farther on he wrote the following about the minister:

He wants to upgrade the nation's work force fast. But Ottawa is inexperienced at the education game and has been unwilling to listen to advice from the provinces.

Another part lies in a liberal dose of what is described as bureaucratic arrogance by Ottawa, misunderstandings and some legislative bad luck.

At that time the Ottawa bureau of the *Globe and Mail* received answers from the department and from the minister which were published in an article that appeared on the same page. It was headed, "And Ottawa Points A Finger Right Back", and contained some of the defences and explanations. Part of it reads as follows:

The change means that the federal government has taken on the full cost of training or retraining adults, leaving the provinces with the full cost of educating the young.

The federal spokesman also said that newly arrived immigrants accorded landed immigrant status will be able to count their time spent in the labour force in their country of origin when applying for living allowances for job retraining here. This will place them in the same position as Canadian members of the labour force.

The new regulations also make exceptions from the three-year rule for persons with dependents. Individuals who have been out of school for 12 months and have dependents will qualify for the training allowance.

Farther on it goes on to say:

Federal officials explain that the reason for prohibiting school-age youths from qualifying is to prevent some from dropping out of school, collecting the training allowance and then returning to regular schooling.

I will not repeat what the minister and his parliamentary secretary have said already or what I said or what the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam said, but let me point out that we have now had some months in which to see what has happened. I took the trouble to write to the city of Toronto over a month ago. We now have the record. It is a pretty bleak one and the minister will see the need for giving us an explanation almost immediately. Here it is. In the last year the number of people taking retraining