

Government Organization

[English]

Mr. Bell (Carleton): The member for Carleton put into effect the policies which are now bearing fruit.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Translation]

Mr. Marchand: Now, if this were actually the case, I hope the member for Carleton will wait a few years in order to ascertain the results of the immigration policy we are now implementing.

At any rate, immigration must surely, but not exclusively, be related in some way to the requirements of the labour market.

Besides, when we ask immigrants to come to Canada, we are dealing with men who have relatives here and who want to make a living in our country. I feel that to restrict immigration exclusively to the requirements of the labour market in Canada would make for an inhuman and unacceptable policy. It is not our intention, therefore, to restrict immigration in this manner. Besides, I hope we shall be in a position very shortly to introduce in the house amendments which will no doubt enable the member for Carleton to sleep peacefully and to feel reassured about Canada's future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few members made remarks; first, the member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire), who is not here—

Mr. Grégoire: No, I am here.

Mr. Marchand: No, he has not gone. We did not have too many translation problems. We thought, of course, of translating "manpower" by "puissance de l'homme," but this could have created some confusion, or would have constituted a misrepresentation.

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Chairman, if the future minister of manpower allows me, throughout his statement, he used a very appropriate term which he chose himself and which, I feel, would enhance even more the part he has to play. It is human capital. It is capital rather than manpower. Manpower designates something more finished, whereas human capital indicates a power. Since the minister used the term "human capital" all the time, I think that term might have been properly used.

Mr. Marchand: I thank the hon. member, but there is something else that is more important. Anyway, sir, that is not what I want to undertake.

It was indicated during the debate that the word "immigration" was removed from the title of the department. I listened with attention to those who spoke about it, including the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) and several others. I was impressed, not because I think that the name can change the policy or structure, but this emphasizes a reality which we all follow very intently.

Since there is no point in having useless discussions simply to win an argument or imagining that because something was done once, it would be wrong to amend it and to weaken our position. I am ready to move that the new department be named "the Department of Manpower and Immigration".

Mr. Fulton: Has the Prime Minister appointed you *ex officio*?

Mr. Marchand: I will see him early tomorrow morning, before you advise him.

I therefore move:

That the words "Department of Manpower" in subsection (1) of clause 11 be replaced by the words "Department of Manpower and Immigration" and "new Minister of Manpower", in the same clause, be replaced and that the same amendment be made wherever the words "Department of Manpower", "Minister of Manpower and Deputy Minister" are found, more particularly in subsection (2) of clause 11, as well as in clauses 12, 13, 14, 33, 35, in paragraph (d) of clause 36, in subsections (1) and (2) of clause 39, in Schedule A and Schedule B.

Mr. Winters: Mr. Chairman, I second the amendment in question.

● (9:20 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Knowles: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, was it necessary that some other minister move the amendment? After all, the bill is in the name of the Prime Minister and it is perfectly in order for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to move the amendment. The second point of order I wish to raise is whether this is a proper form in which to amend several clauses of a bill. After all, we have only clause 11 before us at the moment.

Mr. Fulton: By unanimous consent.

Mr. Knowles: If it is done by unanimous consent I am willing to join in that consent. But there is another point. Should the amendment not have in its earlier lines some reference to the heading that appears in the bill preceding clause 11? Let us change not only the language of the bill but the heading which precedes clause 11. I suggest this could be done by altering the amendment at the beginning to read, that the heading preceding