

*Department of Labour Act*

that the *Labour Gazette* has not been published since that time. The backdating is for the purpose of dealing with the outgoing section, not for the purpose of dealing with the incoming Section 4.

I trust that explains the situation to the hon. member. I can assure him that the drafting of Section 4 in such a way as to have the word "shall" in it at least twice, as the former section had also, is perhaps aimed at assuring any people who had regret upon the passage of the *Labour Gazette* that the responsibility will still be on the Department of Labour to continue to collect and publish statistics, though not necessarily solely through a labour gazette, and not necessarily on a monthly basis rather than another length of time. That, I trust, is an explanation which meets the concern and constructive comment of the hon. member.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for trying to explain what has aroused my curiosity. Quite frankly, I am still confused, because if all that he said was completely true, why not just make the bill effective June 1 of this year? Then the hon. member would have no problem with suspicions like mine. I will just leave it at that because it is not the main subject I want to speak to.

What struck me about this bill was the double use of the word "shall". I am now informed by the minister that it was in the previous legislation. I presume the second "shall" was not in the previous legislation. It reads:

—shall institute and conduct inquiries into important industrial questions upon which adequate information may not at present be available.

Is that part new? If it is not new, then certainly there has been a lot of laxity in the last 50 years since Mackenzie King was in this chamber. I am simply pointing out that the phrase "shall institute and conduct inquiries into important industrial questions" is a very significant and pregnant type of phrase.

● (1430)

**Mr. Regan:** It is in the former section.

**Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** In the proposals I shall put forward it is clear, then, that to help the job-creating purpose of the Department of Labour, as opposed to settling disputes, is very important to this country.

This country has suffered terribly this last 50 to 60 years because we have never had any follow through on the work we have done in the various sections of government that would add to the final production, namely, new jobs. Everyone knows and accepts that Canada has what the world needs. Every child from the time he starts school spends his life learning how much Canada has in the form of wealth of all sorts. We always come up against the fact that even though we have it all, we are not doing very much with it in a co-ordinated manner. We call "doing something with it" intelligently by various names. One of the names that we use for it is "industrial strategy".

I have some knowledge of the history of the pre-1914 period. I have a lot more knowledge of the events of the 1920s and 1930s. I might say I have a very intimate knowledge of the events in the 1960s. One complaint Canadians have a right to hold against governments is that they have failed to push through the work done in bits and pieces here and there in government and outside of the government in getting a clear-cut industrial strategy so that the whole world knows where we are going.

One thing that holds this up, which I tie to labour, is the input into final decisions, which never seem to come from governments. Labour needs to know where the opportunities are. Labour should be able to throw its considerable weight, which it has in Canadian public affairs, in the direction of making more jobs for the people they represent.

For example, the Association of Canadian Geographers published a report as a contribution to the centennial year of 1967 which set out the need for Canada to immediately press forward with doing those things which would facilitate four new industrial complexes. These were to be set up in Canada to relieve the pressure on the one complex we do have running along the St. Lawrence to Windsor and Sarnia, which is obviously heating up and getting overcrowded. The cost of living is going up so fast that we are pricing those workers out of jobs.

We have had a series of crises over the last 20 years and we have handled them on an ad hoc basis. That whole area is now paying the price for the lack of a planned decision to shift the emphasis toward developing areas needed for industrial complexes which will spread the load and reduce the growth rate in the overheated area.

I will not quote all of the industrial complexes in this bill, but I want to make it very clear that the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec are suffering terribly by the lack of decision-making over the last 25 or 30 years. This downward trend of the economy in Ontario and the danger to the southwestern part of Ontario at the present time is very great. If we could take the reading of this bill seriously and really believe that a minister of labour would insist that the word "shall" in the legislation means shall, and that the minister could make certain that his department does produce studies on industrial questions, not only would the labour force be served well but we would all be served well.

I know that these things are being done in half a dozen different places in federal departments. I know they are being done at the provincial government level, but as the Resources for the Tomorrow Conference of 1961 showed, there was no driving force to pull it all together to make an industrial strategy.

Every time problems are raised, particularly over the last 20 years, all that government has done about them is to reorganize and set up new departments. More and more departments are set up, and they are all doing the same thing. The more we reorganize, the more the problems grow. Departments are so thoroughly organized in their own fields that they are not co-ordinating their work. We could have much better action if