

Business of Supply

housing or other socially desirable objectives or at certain times must not go anywhere if we are dealing with inflation, or if the insurance companies will not co-operate and cannot be dealt with in any way it may mean that the complete responsibility for insurance funds should be taken over by the government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must draw his attention to the fact that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the house agree that the hon. member should continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall conclude very quickly. I am suggesting that we need a totally new reorientation of our priorities to deal meaningfully with unemployment. We must shift from an overwhelmingly privately owned and controlled consumer-oriented economy toward one which is concerned with important public priorities. Only by obtaining this kind of leading influence over investment policies can we achieve a program of year-round, full employment which is really essential and is the most meaningful way of dealing with student unemployment which occurs in the summer.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"because of its reliance on the unplanned private sector and its failure to emphasize the role of the public sector in promoting the full utilization of all our manpower resources".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is therefore on the amendment. Is the house ready for the question?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I listened with attention to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in support of his motion and to the speech and subamendment of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I welcome the interest in the manpower activities of the government, and especially this opportunity to outline some of the activities of the Department of Manpower and Immigration in this field.

I have in my hand a report prepared in 1965 by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development on manpower policies and programs in Canada. In that year the O.E.C.D. conducted an intensive study of manpower policy and programs in Canada. The conclusions of that independent body were extremely complimentary to the role Canada had played in the development of manpower policies. Of course, since that report was prepared the new Department of Manpower and Immigration has been established, existing programs have been strengthened and expanded, and some new programs have been undertaken.

The motion of the Leader of the Opposition expresses non-confidence in the government because it has failed to provide for the development of manpower resources in general in Canada and has failed to provide for the development and retention especially of student manpower resources. I must say that I am somewhat surprised at the motion and the selection of this subject matter as a basis of seeking non-confidence in the government. It seems to me that this government and its immediate predecessor have been more heavily committed to the development and potential of Canada's manpower resources—

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Orlikow: This is just talk.

Mr. MacEachen: —than any previous governments since confederation. The commitment is clear, pervasive, substantial and expensive. It is not a new dedication or a new commitment. It was outlined by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, in 1965 and 1966 and it has resulted in programs, in legislation and in expenditures that have been approved by parliament that make Canada one of the leading nations in the world in the development of our manpower resources. To suggest that we have been reluctant and hesitant, that we have been lethargic and indifferent in this field, is to fly in the face of facts in view of the very heavy expenditures that are being carried by the taxpayers of Canada in support of the substantial manpower programs.

It is inevitable that any modern government would take this attitude because we realize, as does this motion, that the development of the human and manpower resources of any country is closely linked not only to the satisfaction of the individual but to the growth of the national economy, the increase in productivity and, of course, the reduction