

Government Organization

power and the official opposition party, because the prestige of parliament as a whole is at stake—for Canadians now have such a poor opinion of parliament that it is a reflection on the government.

Those who see the men responsible for government at work here know that this is undeserved, but it is probably the system which is wrong. Now, it is urgent to carry out reorganization in this direction from the psychological point of view, so that the prestige of parliament may be restored and so that public opinion may regain some esteem for its government.

By relieving the pressure on each of the men responsible, you will give them time to lead a normal life, to meet Canadians in all circumstances, to think and meditate a bit more and to consult people who are experts in their fields in order to establish a general planning of the whole administration of Canada, which they have difficulty in doing at this time, unless they work 24 hours a day, seven days a week with no holidays. As things now stand, they must necessarily expedite too many things, which is not a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have understood the spirit in which I make these remarks. My intention is not to blame anybody, but to point out to the house as a whole—besides I know that my colleagues have noticed it themselves—that is urgent for some kind of co-operation in a gesture of good will, and all members of the house could support the government, if it should decide, one of these days, to carry out this radical reform on the basis of business principles which must prevail in the year 1966 in which we live, and put aside for a while this sort of conservatism—not in the political sense of the word—which requires us to keep this old system, this old method and these old frameworks which came into existence elsewhere centuries ago and which save for a few months, were put into practice here a century ago.

● (7:50 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond): I had intended to direct my attention during this debate to the department of manpower but something has happened which has caused me to change the tenor of my remarks. The idea of a department of manpower makes sense to me. The idea that you have within the same department the administration of all which is concerned with

recruitment of manpower outside the country, as well as those who are concerned with technical and vocational assistance which has to do with manpower within Canada, and with meeting the manpower demands of the country, also makes sense to me. I had intended to suggest that a system of education should be established within the department of manpower. However, as a result of a newspaper report of Saturday, May 21, I find I have to change my approach. This afternoon in the house some members asked some questions of the Secretary of State (Miss LaMarsh) as to whether an office of education had been formed within her department. This article which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* on Saturday written by Joan Cohen I should like to quote in order to make more clearly my point. This article has not appeared in other newspapers and I am sure many members of this house are not aware of this latest development, if the article is correct. It states:

Without fanfare, the federal government has located a home for education within its administration.

Gearing itself for sharp escalations in its support of post-secondary education, it has acted on a central recommendation of the universities-sponsored Bladen Commission on Financing Higher Education and charged the secretary of state with responsibility for co-ordinating its spending programs.

It is now looking for a person who, as adviser to State Undersecretary G.G.E. Steele, can tenderly take the reins in a variety of tasks ranging from policy formulation to program administration.

So far, the government has taken only interim action on this massive assistance program called for by the Bladen report, and its temporizing formula for boosting aid has had its critics.

A clearer picture of where the governments are headed should emerge in Victoria next month when a federal-provincial conference gets down to hard-nosed discussion of the commission's findings, such as the estimated doubling—to \$1,314,000,000 annually—of university costs by the start of the 1970s.

Mr. Steele, in an interview this week, was clearly sensitive about the entrance of the word "education" into a department of the federal government. Until now, university grant programs have been administered on a part-time basis by officers in the finance department.

"At the federal level of government, this move will cause regular co-ordinated discussions to take place, as well as close liaison with people in provincial jurisdictions."

He stressed that responsibility for federal programs will remain in the hands of the authorities now administering them.

The planning will bring in the National Research Council, the Medical Research Council and the Canada Council. It will involve the manpower programs and administrators in the department of health and welfare of the \$500,000,000 health resources fund.