

Government Organization

problems that will inevitably come up for decision?

The Minister of Labour is to preside over something that is less than the former Department of Labour. That has been taken away from him. I do not see why matters such as technical and vocational training and on-the-job training were taken away from the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour and put under that of the minister of manpower. One can only hope that the fragmentation of the Department of Labour will not inevitably lead to fragmented policies at a time, particularly in the days ahead, when a positive, consistent manpower policy is an economic necessity. That such a danger exists is recognized both by unions and by management.

I should like to quote from an article that appeared in the *Monetary Times* of February, 1966:

Training and retraining schemes quietly launched in the early 60's, are, in the national context, still little more than embryonic, yet their results are already startling.

I bring this to the attention of the government, Mr. Speaker. An injustice is being done to the Department of Labour. These things belong there, and were started there. The programs I refer to have been transferred from the Department of Labour where the personnel had knowledge of them to the department of manpower where the personnel are not familiar with them.

One can only hope that these proposed changes will carry on the effectiveness of the programs I have mentioned, and will ensure the effectiveness of future programs, if there are to be any. Of great importance is the leadership that will be given by the minister in the department. I only hope that the Department of Labour and its personnel will be given some sort of uplift so that the morale of that department, which has sunk to a new low at the present time, will be lifted up again.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), stated generally our view on this legislation during the resolution stage. I merely wish to emphasize one or two points and make some comments, if I may, on the remarks of the Prime Minister, particularly those of today.

First of all may I say that I always like to approach such changes in machinery as this

[Mr. Starr.]

represents by asking the question: why are the changes necessary? Furthermore, and this probably applies equally to all hon. members, including the right hon. gentleman, machinery interests me a great deal less than the policy which the machinery is intended to carry out.

As an amateur student of political science I would think that the reasons which enforce changes in the government set-up are four. First, there is the immense increase in government functions and responsibilities as well as in government expenditure. I remind myself that only 30 years ago our total budget was in the neighbourhood of half a billion dollars, if I remember correctly. Today I suppose federal government expenditures, budgetary and non-budgetary, are about 23 or 24 times as great. This is the first reason why the machinery we have had heretofore cannot possibly be effective today.

I assume the second reason which has moved the government to think of reorganization derives from the new problems our society faces, problems thrown up by the scientific revolution, by automation and cybernation, and the importance of manpower in such a situation. It seems to me we are approaching an age when we shall need to make fundamental changes in a social ethic which has to a great extent been built up on the idea of work but which may in the future have to be built on the notion of leisure. We have an entire compendium of phrases prising work per se. We admire the person who keeps his nose to the grindstone, though I have always thought this was more a measure of our sadism than of our morality. These new problems make it necessary to have new government machinery.

I suppose the third source of pressure for changes is the new federal-provincial relationship. Aside altogether from the conflicts and the difficulties, the fact is that many of the functions which the British North America Act gave to the provinces have gained in importance and impact. The result is that changes in the federal-provincial relationship are necessary. Aside from anything else, one need only mention education, welfare and road construction to understand the tremendous increase in the importance of the provincial part of our federal set-up. Since the provinces are now taking a much greater share in these developments, both in their own jurisdictions and possibly in Canada as a whole, a new situation arises requiring much