

justify their existence; their buildings would probably be knocked down if they did! We have, in fact, recognized this difficulty and that is one of the very purposes of our project to permit direct support to industry through on-the-job training allowances, one which has shown up very well in the preliminary experiments carried out last year.

Incidentally, I can give hon. members some characteristics of the people who were hired. Sixty-two per cent of them were single and 24 years of age or less. This is an area of unemployment which is bothering all of us—young people seeking their first jobs. Just over 11 per cent of those trained under this program had received less than a grade eight education and 81 per cent had been educated up to grade 13. Fifty-eight per cent of the trainees hired did complete their training. Unfortunately, 34 per cent quit voluntarily and about 8 per cent were discharged for one reason or another. Of those who completed their training—and I think this is an indication we are on the right path—93 per cent are employed, 90 per cent of them in the very occupations in which they were trained under this scheme, and 89 per cent stayed with the employer who undertook to train them in the first place. A further interesting fact is this: of all the trainees who were hired, only 7 per cent are known at this point to be unemployed. I think this is an indication that though we may be far from perfection, and while much more must be done to make this project more productive, the whole operation is beginning to take on a good flavour and produce results. I think those engaged in it should be allowed to carry on and that we should not entertain the idea embodied in this motion that the vote before us should be reduced to one dollar, thereby severely handicapping the operations of the Manpower department.

A word about the concern the hon. member for Timiskaming expressed about the operations of the office in his own constituency. He claims there are more employees in that office than have been placed through it. I certainly do not like to dispute the hon. member's interpretation of the situation but I should be glad of an opportunity to check into it and, if necessary, we might be able to do something about it in a very direct manner. But I hope he is wrong, and was using this particular situation as an example, with poetic licence—I know he is a poet. In any case, I would ask him to reconsider his amendment because the effect of it would be one which I do not think he or his hon. friends or, indeed, any hon. member in any other section of the House would, on sober reflection, desire to bring about. I think their consciences would bother them thereafter if this somewhat mischievous suggestion were carried to the conclusion he seeks.

Mr. Peters: May I ask the minister a question? I gather he is as confused as I am as to which vote applies to training. I notice that in the main estimates it is vote 10 which refers to the training program, not vote 5. Vote 5 relates to operations. I may be wrong in this assumption, but I did check the main estimates and I believe not.

I will agree with the minister that I did use poetic licence when referring to the number for whom employment has been found. I did, however, make a survey, and 82 per cent of the people who replied stated they had never succeeded in securing a job through the efforts of the manpower offices. In view of this, the talk on the

Supply

streets and the rest of it, I should like to ask whether the manpower operation is conducted differently in the various provinces. In other words, does the record differ considerably as between one province and another in terms of success?

Mr. Andras: I frankly admit I should like an opportunity to get a provincial breakdown.

Mr. Nielsen: And the territories.

Mr. Andras: Yes, indeed. I am always in trouble with the hon. member for Yukon for failing to mention the Yukon and the Northwest Territories explicitly. I know he will never accept—as indeed, I would not, were I in his place—the explanation that these figures were included in the British Columbia figures. But I will get a breakdown for the hon. member. I will give them to him later, if he is disposed to carry on this debate, or if not, I will get them to him privately. I have no doubt in the world that there will be a variation in the statistical performance of various regions owing to the obvious difficulty of placing people in a region of high unemployment as opposed to a region of low unemployment. Without having the figures before me, I am unable to confirm it, but I suspect that in Ontario there will be a higher success ratio since more jobs are available, because unemployment in that province is not as widespread, as in the province of Quebec. However, I should say no more on that subject until I have the facts available.

• (1550)

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, may I make a few remarks with respect to the motion moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming. I listened at considerable length to what the hon. member said, but I can agree with only a very small part of the philosophy he is trying to project at this time. The part of the philosophy I do agree with is that the members on this side of the House have frequently and consistently indicated that the roles of manpower and unemployment insurance should be as one. Both can be effective only if this comes about.

I must give the minister some credit. When he was apprised of this view, he indicated to us during discussion of the miscellaneous estimates that he would like an opportunity to look at the matter and to ascertain why in 1966 it was felt necessary to separate the two. Notwithstanding that the minister has said some 1,300,000 unemployed have been placed by employers and that something like just one million jobs were reported as having been accepted, there still seems to be a heck of a lot wrong with manpower vis-à-vis unemployment insurance. Certainly, I do not hear too many of the people who are looking for assistance and guidance on manpower matters praising the role of the manpower office, so I suggest there must be a breakdown somewhere. Although there are pilot projects which give the individual more choice and may assist him, there must be something wrong with the whole system.

I think I speak on behalf of most hon. members when I say without hesitation that it is not too often we receive letters praising the efficacy of manpower operations. This is why I say there must be something drastically wrong. As far as statistics are concerned, we can appreciate what