

be promoted whenever possible with the many occupation-related employer associations.

Traditional public relations and publicity methods now employed by the Division should be re-examined. Not enough is known even by users of the manpower services about the objectives of current manpower programs. There was ample evidence from the responses of employers to the Committee's enquiries for example that they actively resist the new social orientation of these programs. This lack of understanding must be corrected if relations of employers with the Division are to become more cooperative and mutually beneficial. The information services of the department in particular have a sensitive but vital contribution to make in assisting CMCs to bring this about.

Representatives from industry, labour and welfare agencies on the sub-Committees of the Canada Manpower and Immigration Council should be encouraged to undertake a more active role in the clarification of the Division's objectives in the community.

The public relations activities now carried on by the Division should be re-examined to facilitate improved public awareness of the objectives of manpower policy. The program of seminars with employer associations should be expanded.

Inside the Division: Use of Management Review Teams

The failure in communication within the Division itself is serious. If a clear appreciation of what the Division is trying to do has been formulated at headquarters, it is not always getting through to the operational level. Evidence of this abounded. Both staff and members of the Committee who visited Canada Manpower Centres found many instances where local practice differed widely from departmental directives described in the hearings by senior management officials. This point was also made strongly several times by witnesses who had read the submissions from the Division. The comment of one employer is representative:

I must comment, however, as forcefully as I can that between what you have been told in these submissions is happening within Canada Manpower regarding their projects, their levels of efficiency and performance, and what appears to be happening in actual practice, there exists a gap of immense proportions. (19:5)

This is one of the inevitable consequences of the quite valid decision to decentralize control of the Division into five regions. Decentralization of control may be desirable as an administrative technique, but it makes it difficult for senior management of the Division to be sure there is a uniform effort to apply directives. Decentralization should extend the effectiveness of the Division, not inhibit it. The regional directors are evidently responsible for monitoring the operations of the Canada Manpower Centres within their regions. The local CMC manager is however largely autonomous.

There is a need for a monitoring activity, a need not only to evaluate the placement function as such at this point in time, but to establish some system