

The Address—Mr. Blackburn

Should the courts grant them more generous amounts than ours, we shall be pleased to pay them. Moreover, we shall pay their court and counsel fees.

Another exaggeration has been spread around by the CIAC and a few small politicians badly in need of desperate causes, namely that the government has played Santa Claus for people expropriated from Pickering but has been a miser for Mirabel residents.

These again are falsehoods which do not reflect great credit on the so-called statesmen who, at their best and in front of other people, claim to avow national unity.

Let us consider the facts: first of all, the total cost of the Pickering expropriation amounts to about \$90 million, whereas the Mirabel expropriation is in the neighbourhood of \$148 million.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry I have to interrupt the minister but his time under the rules has expired.

● (1250)

[English]

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I enter the throne speech debate. I should like to begin by extending my sincerest congratulations to both the mover (Mr. Stollery) and the seconder ((Mr. Pelletier) (Sherbrooke)) to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I should also like to extend my very best wishes to the new Governor General and Mrs. Léger.

As we know, the throne speech itself is not that important. What is important is the legislation that will flow from it. If this parliament is to survive its second session, that legislation must be in the best interests of the majority of Canadians. Though we are all vitally concerned about the energy crisis, the soaring cost of living, exorbitant residential mortgage rates and the tremendous cost of building lots across the country, my primary concerns in this address are manpower strategies and unemployment insurance. The Speech from the Throne stated:

Other measures will be taken to increase production and employment through providing workers with improved access to available jobs, and employers with improved access to Canada's manpower.

I am glad that the Department of Manpower and Immigration has finally decided to become an efficient manpower mechanism. It has taken nearly eight years and approximately \$2.5 billion of the taxpayers' money even to reach inefficient levels of operation. Dr. W. T. Dymond, a former assistant deputy minister who helped set up the manpower department, stated in a paper dated December 28, 1972:

Although CMCs were contacted by 76 per cent of all job searchers, they only had an 11 per cent success ratio in finding jobs as compared to much higher ratios up to 27 per cent scored by such methods as checking with employers and friends and relatives.

If these statistics are accurate, and I assume they are considering their source, then Manpower has been in a deplorable mess over the last seven years. To reinforce my argument still further, I quote from another source which is just as reliable. In an article entitled "A Critical Look at Present and Future Social Security in Canada", printed in the *Social Worker*, Volume 41, No. 4, winter of 1973, Professor David P. Ross had this to say:

[Mr. Dubé.]

Manpower and employment services must be judged a failure when considered from the standpoint of the needs of those with low incomes.

I should emphasize here that Manpower's greatest case-load comes from low income job searchers. Canada Manpower Centres just cannot seem to attract skilled and semi-professional job searchers for some unaccountable reason. Professor Ross continued:

Job placement suffers from the fact that Manpower Centres are almost exclusively employer and demand oriented, and as such they have tended to be little more than job bulletin boards. The needs of the unemployed have been paid scant attention to, and the special employment needs of long-term social assistance recipients have been all but ignored.

These are the people who need assistance in re-entering the work force the very most, and yet that \$2.5 billion has been wasted. In fact, with respect to retraining Professor Ross had this to say in the same article:

The federal adult retraining program has also had little success. The Economic Council of Canada concluded in a recent study that the average post-training income in earnings was in the vicinity of 5 per cent; this means that an individual with pre-training earnings of \$2,000 per year could expect post-training earnings of \$2,100. Not exactly a big push in the struggle to escape poverty. Moreover, the council concluded that the employability of the trainee was not noticeably enhanced: if you tended to be frequently unemployed before training, then you tended to be frequently unemployed after training.

Perhaps it is time to take a hard critical look at the entire Manpower retraining program, particularly in view of the fact that in my opinion it is far too classroom oriented. I would like to quote briefly from the eighth annual review of the Economic Council of Canada at page 104. It states:

There are, in fact, a number of advantages to training in industry relative to institutional training, of which a few will be described here. First, it seems clear that some degree of experience with the work environment is essential for almost all jobs; familiarity with the physical plant, materials, co-operating personnel, the institutional rules of the work place, and the discipline and regimen of the job is required for satisfactory performance. This can rarely be simulated adequately away from the work place. In the latter environment, moreover, the relevance of the instruction to the job is much more readily apparent, and this tends to make the trainee a more attentive student.

One can argue that Canada Manpower does in fact have on the job training, but I would like to point out that this program is both too small and not sufficiently structured and administered. I have become quite suspicious of some employers who may fire or lay off steady workers in order to hire manpower trainees, three-quarters of whose wages are paid for by the Canadian taxpayer. I am also convinced that this kind of training is only a temporary or make-work nature in order primarily to hold down the unemployment figures to lessen the embarrassment of the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure whether it is the wish of the House that we allow the hon. member to continue for a few minutes. If not, we will call it one o'clock. I believe the hon. member has gone about one minute after one o'clock which would leave him something like 14 minutes following resumption at two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.