

Manpower Retraining Programs

farmer, the little individual and the humble wage earner—it has been the credit union and co-operative movement. Does the government now intend to get out the knife?

The government has already given concessions to big business. The Liberal party is a big business party; it always has been and always will be. Now, I wonder whether the government has the knife out in an attempt to eliminate these co-operative organizations and credit union organizations which have done so much to build up many of our towns, our businesses and our individuals in centres from one end of the country to the other. I suggest that this aspect of the bill be examined very closely by members in all parties, and that major amendments be offered in this regard. We cannot allow the credit union movement or co-operative movement to go down the drain because some individuals on the cabinet benches are blind to the needs of the co-operatives and credit unions in Canada.

Mr. Prud'homme: We agree with you.

Mr. Harding: Good; I am very pleased to hear it. The time is very close to five o'clock and I shall again be speaking on several aspects of the bill when it comes back to the House, so I shall not go into further detail at this time. However, I trust that in this debate other aspects of the legislation will be discussed thoroughly by members of this House.

[Translation]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, since it is now 4:58 p.m., I wonder if I could call it five o'clock considering we should now proceed to private members' business as listed in the order paper, and continue my comments at eight o'clock. In fact, if I speak now, I will use the two last minutes, because I intend to talk about the amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Hon. members have heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Joliette. Is it the pleasure of the House to call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Agreed.

[English]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Simcoe-North (Mr. Rynard)—Health—Canadian Medical Association request for expansion of facilities to train doctors—Government action; the hon. member for Fraser Valley-West (Mr. Rose)—Fruit—Request by British Columbia growers for export assistance—Legislation to protect against dumping of agricultural products; the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall)—Natural

[Mr. Harding.]

Resources—Offshore mineral rights—federal position respecting Sable Island.

* * *

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed Bill S-2, to incorporate United Bank of Canada, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions (papers), private bills and public bills.

• (5:00 p.m.)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**MANPOWER****REQUEST FOR COPY OF REPORT RECOMMENDING
52-WEEK LIMIT ON RETRAINING PROGRAMS**

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the report by the task force in the Department of Manpower and Immigration which recommended a 52-week limit for all federal government manpower retraining programs.

He said: I do not suppose that in the history of the Canadian government there has been a department established which has grown in scope as quickly as the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The number of people working for the department and the amount of money spent have shown a spectacular increase in every year since the department has been established. In answer to a question put on the order paper some time ago—an answer which was tabled about a week ago—we were told that the number of people who are finding jobs as a result of being referred to the jobs by the department has been dropping each year since the department has been established. We were also told that the number of people who found jobs last year as a result of being referred to the employer by the Department of Manpower and Immigration was substantially smaller than the number of people who were able to find jobs in the last year in which the old national employment service was acting as a job placement agency.

At the same time, the number of people who are working for the department has increased in almost geometric progression. The figures given in answer to my question, which of course I do not have with me today, indicate that the cost of placing a person in a job under the old national employment service came to about \$26 per person. The cost last year for the Department of Manpower and Immigration, if one only uses the number of people who are employed by the department in the placement field and the salary which they receive, has increased more than