

Private Members' Business

the part of perhaps the Speaker, or at least other members, to smile when I say that.

That part of Canadian Jobs Strategy has worked; namely, job entry and job re-entry. It has done well in my area. I think the program is good, but I also think that the people who have made it work in my area have done a very good job. They have had success rates of something like 90 per cent in placements when dealing with so-called ordinary clients; and when dealing with social assistance-type recipients they have trained—we call those SAR in the short-form language that Employment and Immigration Canada uses—they have had success rates of something like 75 per cent.

That is pretty good, as far as I am concerned. When you find jobs for three out of every four, particularly given the unemployment that is in the constituency that I represent, those programs have been successful. This is a good opportunity for me to state that and to compliment those who have made the program work in my constituency.

[Translation]

But I would certainly not want us to pass a motion forcing the school boards I just mentioned to hire the very people they trained. That would kill the programs in no time, Madam Speaker, for lack of participation, if the school boards had to keep, to retain, to hire every person they provided with this kind of training.

So, I want to tell my colleague from Essex-Windsor that, while there is no doubt good points in his proposal, there are flaws in the formulation of his motion, and I have already indicated a few to the House. There may be others as well, as we might find out from other speakers who will describe what the situation is in their ridings as part of this debate.

It might be worth exploring the subject further though. Perhaps the hon. member would agree to withdraw his motion and refer the issue to a parliamentary committee so that could be considered the whole problem described by the parliamentary secretary when he told us, for instance, that some industries, rather than training their own employees, prefer to go and lift some from smaller employers who cannot afford to pay them as well. That is not unusual in the industry.

[English]

Madam Speaker, another thing we should look at as well is this whole business of how seniority and wage structure in some industries is developing at the present time. I bring this problem to your attention so that if we are to study the subject matter, I would hope that we would also study the difficulty within industry whereby, for instance, trainees and particularly apprentices are paid much less than, for instance, a janitor.

Let me set out that proposition. If you are a janitor in a plant and you make a certain salary, and you would like to train to be a machinist of some sort, or a skilled worker, you often have to take a cut in salary in order to become an apprentice. That is a big problem that we should study, should we decide to withdraw that motion and refer the subject matter.

I have enumerated some of the problems that I see that need to be studied further, but I think that the motion as presently worded does offer, perhaps, more problems than it does solutions.

[Translation]

Hon. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, this is a historic event. One of my colleagues, our friend, the hon. member for Burlington quoted the *Toronto Star* positively. Another one, a founding member of the rat pack actually congratulated the government. This is a truly memorable day, Madam Speaker!

Madam Deputy Speaker: I could not agree more with the hon. member. This is, of course, International Women's Day.

[English]

Hon. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise on this motion. Like my friend from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, I had some of the same difficulties with reading the face of the motion. I listened, therefore, with interest to the hon. member for Essex—Windsor, who has been a friend of mine. We were at college together, so I listen with great care to what he says because he often has useful things to say, as he did here today.

My dilemma is that I agreed with about two-thirds of what he said that had nothing to do with the motion that is before us, but what he said with regard to the motion