

Adult Occupational Training Act

jobs while creating jobs through training programs would not be a better solution to the present unemployment problem.

How can 16 per cent of 55 per cent of required training secure a future for the candidate selected? What positive contribution can 16 per cent of a minimum of training make to the expansion of my business?

This case relates to a man who repairs and sells television sets. In fact, this businessman simply wanted to train electronics technicians. He feels it is really ridiculous that the manpower centre should dare believe that people will get appropriate training within eight weeks in such an important field as electronics.

I now continue my quotation:

Until I get proof to the contrary, I must conclude to a lack of seriousness in such decisions because 16 per cent is far from enough to meet the very objective of this training program set up by the government.

I have working for me a number of candidates to the manpower training program who deserve better job security and whose open minds, initiative and general ability should be encouraged. As for me, please believe that I will do my utmost to keep those employees.

By this letter surely you will admit the seriousness and aggressiveness of my business since the start and no less can be expected from those involved.

In another area, I would point out that other industrialists in my riding where approached last fall, that is to say in early January, when the government implemented a similar program. Officials of the Quebec manpower centre visited Loretteville and Saint-Emile where you can still find a fair group of glove and shoe manufacturers.

At that time they were proposed a program similar to that presented today. Long questionnaires were completed with the help of experts from the Manpower Centre.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed program was to last 26 weeks and all projects were to be submitted before March 31. However, for those who had made applications in January, answers were sent out in the afternoon of March 29 only, which was Holy Thursday. Those manufacturers who had jobs to offer were told that their programs had been accepted, even though the legislation stipulated that first they had to apply to manpower centres to get workers. Therefore, in waiting until Holy Thursday to inform the workers of the Loretteville and St. Emile area, the government was getting rid of them easily since the Quebec City manpower centre was closed on both Good Friday and the next day. These people had to wait until the next Monday to give an answer. So, in many cases, those manufacturers who were in a position to take in 30, 40, 50 or 60 workers finally hired only 5 or 10. Finally, the whole project went down the drain, especially when one considers that one manufacturer could have hired 50 people instead of the 5 that he actually did hire.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunate situation, even if this bill is good. But to return once again to our manufacturers. When working for the federal government, especially in the Income Tax Division, even the most intelligent man in the world may behave stupidly simply because he walks around with a copy of the act in his pocket. Should he fail this year, he can always turn to the past four years to pick the pockets of Canadians and run away with what he can find. But for the businessman, the shoe and glove manufacturer at that, it is a completely different story. He

[Mr. Godin.]

must hire travelling salesmen who must look after the orders. They have to buy leather for their industry and all kinds of materials essential to them and that must be done months in advance.

Whenever Manpower Centre employees discuss with manufacturers, they realize that they are not dealing with tax officials, that they are not dealing with people looking backward. The manufacturer is a man who has to look forward and take care of his business. If he did not, he would soon have to close shop. Those who are still in business are those who looked after their undertaking and I should like the government to give them full co-operation. Those people have done their utmost to make our country what it is today.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I should like the minister to give us the assurance that his budget will be important enough to come up to everything he is offering at the present time and I am wondering whether it would not be beneficial for the Canadian people to have a revision made in manpower centres in order to know what agents will assist manufacturers in cases such as this one.

And whenever a person is refused admission to a certain course, I should like manpower centre officials to be in agreement with one another so as to give the same answer every day. If the answer differs, it is too bad for people lose confidence in such programs.

It is for that reason that many citizens show dissatisfaction and I believe they are right, because we lied to them too often. Moreover, it is about time we helped them in every possible way and especially made financial means available to them.

So I hope that the minister will not miss the opportunity to explain such needs to all his colleagues, particularly the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) who after all is the last one to sign his name.

[English]

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to spend a few minutes discussing a particular aspect of the amending bill which the minister has placed before us. I refer particularly to the subject matter of Sections 5 and 6 of the act to which the minister's bill proposes certain modifications.

I think it is clear that with regard to the authority which is conferred upon the minister, the act may be divided into two parts. First, there is authority to enter into agreements with the public authority, the province, to spend public funds of the government of Canada; second, to enter into agreements with private authorities such as industrial corporations. From my understanding with regard to entering into agreements with the public authority for the expenditure of money for manpower training, the individual taking the training either has to be referred to and approved by a manpower officer or has been approved in effect through the legislation of the respective provinces under their various training programs. This makes it clear there is a direct dealing, either by the federal or provincial authority, with the individual involved in a training program. It is my understanding that this relationship between the individual and the manpower office of the federal government or a parallel office under an apprenticeship training program of a province is