

Government Organization

economy as the result of strikes, yes, regardless even of the fact that some such disputes have resulted in strife. The ministers have taken the attitude that it is not their business to effect settlements. They would rather use the services of strangers, thereby hoping to bring about settlement of the disputes.

In the Department of Labour we endeavoured to set up in the past a committee which had to do with the bringing about of a better relationship between management, labour and government. This machinery was set up but it has now been dismembered. No effort is being made to use it. We want to know whether the proposed reorganization is going to bring about a better understanding between management, labour and government.

How will consultation between these bodies be possible under this new set-up? Surely the minister of manpower will agree that consultation is not only a major but a very important issue to the three bodies of Canadians I have mentioned. Consultation should be carried out on a continuing basis rather than haphazardly from time to time.

Under this proposal the Department of Labour is broken up and morale is low. There will be a department of manpower headed by a minister who, I must admit, has very great experience in dealing with labour matters. He has a good record of energy and accomplishment in the labour movement. Yet he is given half a department or perhaps less than half a department to deal with labour under the new set-up. Immigration is thrown in as compensation. We are doing away, as a matter of fact, with the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

In the bill setting up the new ministry of manpower it is proposed that the new department will deal with the utilization of manpower resources in Canada as well as employment services and immigration. However, citizenship has gone by the board. There will be no department for that.

An hon. Member: Carried.

Mr. Pearson: You should read the bill.

Mr. Starr: Citizenship is going to one department and immigration to another. Both these subjects came under the function of one department. Citizenship and immigration have not changed. Now, however, the minister of manpower has part of the functions of the former Department of Labour but not

all of them. He also has only a part of the function to do with immigration.

Surely the question pops into one's mind, is immigration not important enough to warrant the full time attention of a minister? Are immigration criteria to be established purely and solely on the basis of the demands of the labour market? Is that what is intended under this reorganization? Are we going back to the days when immigrants were allowed in according to the demand for labour? Is this what the government has in mind? Surely in immigration other factors have to be considered. Surely the very important humanitarian factors must be considered.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Starr: After all, we are dealing with people. We are not dealing with so many ciphers on the labour market. One is led to believe that the new manpower policy will deal with members of the labour force and with immigrants as ciphers only. The humanitarian aspect of things seems to have gone out of style with this government.

In the application of manpower policies the minister of manpower will not have direct contact with the conciliation services of the Department of Labour. Those are to come under another minister. The minister of manpower will not have the benefit of the many years of experience of those officers left in the Department of Labour who have dealt with problems in the field of labour. After all, the minister of manpower has to do with labour, but that is under a different minister. The minister of manpower, despite all his experience in dealing with labour unions, will find that he is not operating from one side of the fence or the other but that he is walking on the fence. This is very different from his experiences as a union leader.

The minister will also be dealing with management but not in the way he did as a union leader. Yet the officers of the department having experience in these matters are not to be under his jurisdiction but under the Department of Labour. Under these circumstances one can only hope that here will be the most intimate consultation and exchange between himself and the Minister of Labour because in effect they are both administering different parts of the same department.

What bothers and worries some of us is how these divisions are going to be brought about. What sort of liaison will there be between the two departments in dealing with