

we arrived. Unfortunately, we have not given them the place that they should have in our society.

I have met people from outside of Canada who watched the international news last summer. I tell you, that on the channels in Europe, the next item after the war news was the fate of natives in Canada. It was not a good story for Canadians.

• (1040 )

This has to be corrected, and quickly.

I am happy that Mr. Justice Dickson is going to be working on this problem, but what puzzles me is that this seems to be a royal commission to draft the terms of a royal commission. I do not know why we have a government. He might be able to deal with the whole problem, but this is a royal commission to establish the terms of reference of a royal commission. What kind of government is that? I am happy with the choice of Mr. Justice Dickson and I know he will do his best. I hope this process is not being used by the government to allow it to drag its feet because it does not know what to do. We do not want a repetition of the problems we had last year in Canada, action is needed now, urgently.

I would now like to talk about the six points of our proposal.

[*Translation*]

The sixth point is the distribution of power. As I told the Bélanger-Campeau Commission last year, there is nothing sacrosanct about the present division of powers.

We must look for a division of powers that best serves the interests of the people, all the Canadian people. This is an important point, and I would have specific recommendations to make on this subject.

The Fathers of Confederation did a good job when they drafted the Constitution. They drafted it however in the context of 1867, based on the realities of 1867. Now, the time has come for us to review how the powers are divided, but we must do so with the interest of the people in mind. The basic premise should be this: who can do the best job, the federal government or the provincial governments? It should not be done in the interest of ministers who want bigger and larger departments or bureaucrats who want to be in charge of a greater number of civil servants. We must ask ourselves what, in

the interest of the people, is the most efficient way of ensuring this country will be competitive in the years to come. That is what the key consideration should be in this negotiation. It should not be a question of who is going to win or lose.

The winners should be neither the federal government nor the provincial governments, but the people. That is how it should be done!

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Therefore, we recommend a functional approach, because it is possible, as I explained in my speeches of the past couple of days, to solve problems, possibly with additional legislation.

In the case of the environment, for instance, there could be national standards and we need such standards, otherwise a provincial government could offer a manufacturer to set up shop in the province, with the privilege of polluting, which is an enormous advantage.

So, if we had national standards, pollution could not be used to attract nor to reject investors. We do not need two separate groups of civil servants to enforce these standards. The provinces could very well administer them based on local priorities and needs. No administrative duplication is necessary. The same could be done for manpower training.

The Prime Minister mentioned manpower training in the speech from the Throne yesterday. It is an important issue. If nowadays four out of ten Canadian citizens are hindered by a lack of education and training, that is a problem indeed. We must not forget, however, that education is a provincial jurisdiction according to the Constitution.

So, what should we do? The needs of the people can easily be recognized by this Parliament. These are objective standards, including manpower training, but they do not have to be administered by Ottawa, so long as the national objectives are met.

The same is true of regional development. In that case, national standards are needed to take money from the central government and apply it to the regions as well as to account for taxpayers money from across Canada being used just for Northern Manitoba, the