

in from abroad to fill skilled jobs opening up in the country for which we do not have the skilled manpower. We are doing the best we can. We have increased our budget. Last year we put into courses 320,000 adult Canadians. The budget for Canadian manpower training has increased quite substantially; it has been one of the fastest growing budgets in the government over a three-year period.

The hon. lady talked about occupational goals. I do not know fully what she meant and it would require more discussion to ascertain, but we do insist that clients who come to manpower centres for expensive training and allowances, should have objectives that are related to the labour market. We want to help them get jobs and increased incomes. Unless there is a chance that they will get jobs and increased incomes we are limited in our help because our purpose is economically oriented. We are not in the field of general education. It is essential that we don't accept people because they like culture or they want to study music.

Cultural activity is fine, but our program is economically oriented and there has to be a connection between the labour market, the income prospects and the training we provide. I am sure the hon. lady will agree that that is sound philosophy.

Are we training the right people? The hon. member who opened the debate made the point that we are not training the right people. What is the test? We must train people for jobs that are available in the labour market. We do our best to assess the availability of jobs and to match the training to available jobs. That is essential. Basically, we train people who are underemployed and who are unemployed, and whose prospects for increased earnings will be enhanced. I also want to make the point that while it is basically an economic program, it has very important social and anti-poverty objectives.

In Canada we are engaged in a war against poverty, and in my judgment one of the most effective tools in waging that war is an effective manpower program which reduces dependency and which enables individuals to compete successfully on the labour market. So, Mr. Speaker, it is an anti-poverty device. What kind of people are we training? I know that in 1968 we spent about \$100 million on the training of people who were poor or under the poverty line. So, we are attacking that very important element of the problem.

#### *Alleged Failure of Employment Policies*

Then, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that our training is concentrated in areas where unemployment is highest. For example, we spent \$55 per capita of the labour force in the Atlantic provinces in 1969-70; we spent \$37 per capita in Quebec; \$24 per capita in Ontario; \$24 per capita in the Prairies and \$20 per capita in British Columbia. As part of our deliberate policy we tilt the training to the parts of the country where unemployment is greatest. An examination of our allocation of resources will indicate that we have achieved that objective also.

In addition to the regional distribution of the funds, we attempt to spend the money in the seasonal period of high unemployment. We know that the Canadian economy is subject to seasonal lay-offs regardless of the buoyancy of the economy. We have a considerable seasonal problem and we undertake training in that period. Hon. members are worried about the extent of unemployment in the country today. They would be more worried if it were not for the large numbers in training which are four or five times greater in January, February and March than they would be in other months of the year. We think this is good business.

The hon. member may be reassured that we train mostly people who are unemployed, and it seems to me there is not a better basis upon which to make the choice if at all possible. Some 55 per cent of our trainees are unemployed when they start training. Surely one of the most important criteria for providing trainees is employment status.

The suggestion has been made that we are not getting at the really disadvantaged. We are always conscious of getting to people who are on the border of the labour market. I am not saying for one moment that we have at the present time the specialized services that will enable us to get at and service this disadvantaged group in the manner that we would like to. We have under consideration additional programs of a specialized character that we will put into place when we have the resources, but in the meantime we are making a substantial contribution to the disadvantaged, to the poor. As I say, some \$100 million was spent in 1968-69 on training the poor, and proportionately there are now more people under the poverty line in training.

Are you training the poor? That question was asked. I reply, yes, we are training proportionately more of that group than of any other group in the economy. What are you