

and job possibilities, this program will collapse. It will not be maintained by the government, Parliament or public opinion as a welfare program. As the hon. member has said, it must have credibility. We have done two things in appraising the results of the program and we are not finished yet.

We cannot yet give the final answer. We have tried to determine whether this program is putting as much into the economy as it is taking out by way of taxes. We have run the best possible cost-benefit analysis that we could devise in co-operation with the best research agencies in treasury board. Hon. members will be glad to know there is a very positive cost-benefit result from the program. The benefit received is greater than the outlay: it is three to one. It would be better if it were ten to one or one hundred to one, but there is a very favourable cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the minister permit a question? Is he willing to table a copy of that cost-benefit study?

Mr. MacEachen: I think someone has asked for that. There are a lot of print-outs. We will do everything we can to put this before the House in any reasonable way. I will consider that. We have made this cost-benefit analysis and we are continuing to improve it technically. We have also had a follow-up survey of our OTA graduates. The survey was conducted three months after they completed the course to see how these students had done. We have the preliminary results of this survey. They show that nearly 80 per cent of 8,000 students from the Canada Manpower Training Program were employed when surveyed three months after completing the course. Only 41 per cent were employed before the training. We will continue with further surveys to validate this information. The survey shows that the training has had a very positive result in getting these people into the employment market. What we are after is getting jobs for people.

We also wanted to determine by this survey whether their productivity and earnings improved as a result of training courses. The preliminary results show that income increased by 15 per cent, approximately \$55 a month, within three months of graduation. If these courses help to get jobs for these people, keep them employed, increase their earnings and improve their situation, we can have confidence in the effectiveness of the courses. I say without any oratorical flourish but in cold truth that there is no program in

Alleged Failure of Employment Policies

the government of Canada that has been more rigorously examined from the point of view of cost-benefit analysis to determine its effectiveness. We do not think we can get more money for this expanding program unless we can demonstrate that it is effective. We cannot maintain the confidence of Parliament and the public unless it is effective. We know there will be complaints. Of course, there will be complaints in individual cases about procedure and so on. We know there are ways in which we can improve the program. We are examining this aspect all the time.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Might I turn for a moment to an important proposal for a change in the program? It is related to the so-called three-year rule. In order to qualify for allowances there has to be a three-year waiting period. At first glance, one might ask why the department does not allow a person to undertake training and receive an allowance immediately he leaves school. He would learn good habits and receive good orientation while still young. This idea has a certain appeal. But given the fact that there is a budget of \$273 million this year, we have to decide as a department and as a government how the money available can be spent to best advantage. The more people we bring in, the less intensive the coverage becomes. The program was conceived as a means of helping those workers who obtained their education many years ago and who now find it insufficient and obsolete.

My colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) said the purpose of the program was to give people a second chance. We know that in Canada today there are people in their twenties, their thirties and their forties who have missed out. We know that the level of scholarship in Canada is not as high as it is in the United States. We realize that if these people are to get into the mainstream of society and compete successfully on the labour market they must receive training. We realize, too, that a heavy proportion of public funds is being spent on young people.

Some hon. members advocate removing the three-year rule. If this were done, there would undoubtedly be a heavy demand from young people for training and allowances and ultimately we should have to cut down the training available to older people. This is one of the issues which arise in terms of the allocation of resources within the system.