

*Government Organization*

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** The Prime Minister of Canada believed that because of the background of the hon. member for Quebec West, the hon. member could not be charged with responsibility for industrial relations, conciliation services, and for the other services retained in the Department of Labour.

I think the Prime Minister took very much too seriously the hon. gentleman's background as a union leader in one phase of Canadian unionism, and apparently believed that other unions and employees would not accord him full respect as Minister of Labour.

Sir, I have no desire to be the devil's advocate for the hon. member for Quebec West, whose considerable oratorical talents have become known to us. I think the Prime Minister did for the hon. member for Quebec West much less than justice. As a cabinet minister, I believe the hon. member could achieve an objectivity and impartiality equal at least to that of the hon. gentleman for Vancouver Centre, who has always been an executive of businesses which are not insubstantial.

Far be it for me, sir, to advise the Prime Minister on his choice of colleagues. It would have been far better, I say, to make the hon. gentleman for Quebec West Minister of Labour in the old Department of Labour and to return the hon. gentleman for Vancouver Centre to the portfolio of citizenship and immigration, or even to reverse the matter, than to bastardize both departments and to create two political orphans to be known as the departments of manpower and labour.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** Yes, and to choke immigration in the process. That, sir, is what I believe will happen.

Sir, the attenuation, the almost total diminution of the Department of Labour, coupled with the placing of immigration in a secondary policy role, induces me to plead tonight with the government. I wish the Prime Minister were here, so that I might plead especially with him tonight for a restoration of the *status quo ante*.

I believe that this committee should strike out the provisions for the department of manpower which are contained in clauses 11 to 14 inclusive, and when we reach clause 34 dealing with the Department of the Secretary of State, the committee should strike out subclause 1(a). Thereupon the old and generally satisfactory status would be restored.

As I can only move one amendment at a time to one clause, I intend, sir, to move that clause 11 be struck out, and if this motion should be carried, I will move subsequently to strike out clauses 12 to 14 inclusive, and later to amend all dependent and consequential clauses. The net result would be to restore the old Department of Labour, and I would hope to have it strengthened into a genuine department of manpower. I would hope to establish the Department of Citizenship and Immigration into a department freed from the responsibility of Indian affairs, so that the minister and his officers could establish and continue a long range immigration policy coupled with a real program of citizenship education and evaluation, which I do not believe will happen under the Secretary of State.

Therefore, sir, as a start to this general proposal, I move.

That Clause 11 be deleted and all clauses thereafter be renumbered accordingly.

This is the only motion that I have ever moved or ever expect to move in the chamber which would have made the Right Hon. Mackenzie King happy.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this motion is out of order. The principle of the bill which includes the creation of the department of manpower was approved by the house at second reading. Therefore this motion which has been introduced by the hon. member for Carleton is directed to the principle of the bill, and therefore, I submit, out of order.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the point of order. I agree with the Minister of National Revenue that the amendment is out of order, but not for the reasons the minister gave.

I submit that it would be quite within the power of the committee to vote down a clause, or several clauses, even though they were supported in principle on second reading. Where this amendment fails is that it is what is sometimes called an expanded negative. All that is necessary, for the Conservatives to strike out clause 11, is to muster enough votes against it. You cannot by an amendment move to strike out something that you can resolve by voting one way or another.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.