

proposals made to the Committee. The operations of the UIC should be examined at a future date when the revised regulations and organization announced in May 1976 have been in effect long enough to make a valid assessment of the combined operation.

The format of the Committee's approach was designed to encourage the presentation of public as well as professional points of view. Twenty-one hearings were held, including three with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and five with departmental officials. The Committee also heard from economists interested in manpower problems, from employers and associations of employers, from private placement agencies, from spokesmen for disadvantaged workers, and from provincial planners of adult education. Through advertisements placed in papers across Canada written opinions about the effectiveness of the Division's activities were invited from those who had used Canada Manpower services. Employers were approached directly by letter, as well as through their trade associations and Chambers of Commerce. The Canadian Labour Congress was also invited to comment. Individual Committee members and staff members made many personal visits to Canada Manpower Centres and training facilities. The discussion of manpower policy in the *Eighth Annual Review* of the Economic Council of Canada, (1971) provided an important basis for the Committee's work. All of these sources provided insights which were representative both geographically and vocationally of the world of work in Canada.

The Committee has plans to push its experiment a stage further and press for another innovation—again drawing on British experience. Parliamentary reports may be debated in the Senate Chamber, but under present practice this is when the process ends. The government takes from a report what it wants, discards or ignores what it chooses, but there is no way—other than by inferring from analysis of any subsequent changes in policy—of knowing what the government's reactions to it have been and why. This diminishes the value of the report, limits the opportunity of a committee to learn on the job, and denies the Canadian public the last and most important chapter of the study.

To fill this void, the Committee will invite the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to comment on this report and its recommendations, and in particular to explain where and for what reason he and the Manpower Division disagree either by letter or preferably in a public hearing. The Committee believes the Minister will welcome the opportunity to respond and that this would be an important step in completing the public record.

The potential impact of the review of Estimates in the Canadian Parliament in practical terms is less significant as a means of controlling current expenditure and more important as an instrument for influencing future spending. Given this situation, a follow-up procedure is clearly desirable. Government programs should be consistently measured to see if they yield suitable results.

From time to time the Committee will review the recommendations of its reports. If circumstances warrant a further exploration of the topic it will invite the Department or Division concerned to return to describe the administrative