

*Government Organization*

**The Deputy Chairman:** May I draw hon. members' attention to Citation 398 in Beauchesne's fourth edition:

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order.

I declare the amendment in this form is out of order. It will serve the same purpose to vote against clause 11, as such, instead of bringing forward an amendment.

**Some hon. Members:** Carried.

● (9:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marchand:** Mr. Chairman, I think there is more than one way to conceive of government organization. I am not mistaking this for a metaphysical proposition, but I feel that different propositions could be made, possibly all sensible, and the only defence I have to offer is based upon reason and chances of success.

It was indicated that the Department of Labour had been stripped of all meaning and that the new department, as it would be set up, could not fulfil the role that should normally be expected of it.

I should like to point out to the house that in the field of labour, there are two different realities. One is concerned with employers-employees relations, which we call industrial relations and which are basically different from manpower, manpower training, manpower classification and all other services that may be offered to workers and industry in the field of technical training.

This is so true, Mr. Chairman, that when the federal government set up or created, if you wish, what we have called the Labour-Management Co-operation Committee, it was taken out of collective labour agreements. They did not want the two to be mixed together. That is to say, there was a special committee to discuss with management questions of productivity, questions of production, questions of manpower training, and those committees were never incorporated into what was called the industrial relations set-up in the company.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is a sacrilege. One may very well think that it should be otherwise, but to go as far as to indicate that this takes all meaning out of what was established by Right Hon. MacKenzie King or hon. Mr. Lemieux appears to me as pushing conservatism to the point of placing it in jeopardy.

[Mr. Knowles.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to talk too long on this subject. I might have the opportunity to come back to it when particular legislation is considered, but let us say that, independently of government measures, it remains that manpower in Canada is our main resource and we should all agree to try and improve it, to make it more productive and particularly to help the workers to develop fully as far as technical skills are concerned.

A few years ago in the United States a great economist tried to establish what could be the value of the human capital, of the workers. He set the economic value of the work of men in a society at over \$1,000 billion, whereas the financial capital barely reached \$700 or \$800 billion, which means that the value of the men in strict economic terms exceeded by \$500 billion that of the financial capital.

Everyone knows that the increase in production since the beginning of the century is due to a large extent—I would say 85 or 87 per cent—to the improvement of industrial technology which is based itself on the work of men.

Therefore, it is important that we should give special attention to the training of our manpower, to enable it to meet the needs of the enterprise and at the same time to enable the men to develop, to improve normally.

Now, I could answer questions if hon. members deem it advisable to ask some about the constitution of the department. But before resuming my seat, I would like to talk about immigration.

Some fear that immigration will suffer because it comes under the Minister of Manpower. There is no basis for that. It will depend on the government and probably on the Minister of Immigration. It is quite possible to have a department concerned exclusively with immigration and the government through its policy, or the minister, make immigration difficult. There is no relationship between the two.

Here is proof of what I say, Mr. Chairman. I am in favour of having immigration with manpower and I see that last year 140,000 immigrants came to Canada, whereas this year there will be almost 200,000 of them. There has been an increase of 30 per cent in each of the first four months this year, whereas when immigration came under the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell), only 75,000 immigrants came to Canada that year.