

That will not be because of the legislation but because of the attitude of those who will be called upon to implement it and who very often do not have the required qualifications to execute the government's programs, which I believe are well-intentioned. But I think the main weakness in the implementation of this act will be with the bureaucrats, that there again the government will be completely submerged by the voices and opinions of the bureaucrats, that it will end up by saying what it always says: Those are the agreements, those are the federal-provincial agreements. In fact, it is a little like when a department wants to rid itself of a problem, it establishes a royal commission. That is a sort of royal commission of enquiry to rid the governments but I think it creates a most unhappy situation for those who are waiting for such legislation to try and better their lot and make agriculture take a step forward in the province of Quebec.

**Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the official opposition for greeting my intervention with such enthusiasm, but to reassure those whom it might worry, I shall say that I intend to be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that if it was the privilege of the opposition to introduce such an amendment to the motion for third reading, it is surely my privilege to object for reasons I deem reasonable.

If the responsibilities of the council which is to be established by this bill are considered it will be noted that its function under clause 11 is:

To advise the minister on all matters to which the duties, powers and functions of the minister extend, and in particular—

(a) to advise the minister on all matters pertaining to the utilization and development of manpower resources in Canada, including immigrants to Canada and their adjustment to Canadian life;

(b) to refer those matters that the minister requires or that the council deems appropriate, to the appropriate board for a report;

Mr. Speaker, if all the advisers and ministers whether in commissions or as individual were required to report to parliament—and I regret to differ from my colleague from Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) who said that the minister would need a very sound head to consider this—I believe that parliament would be considerably embarrassed tomorrow if in addition to the reports we already receive from crown corporations and from all departments concerned, all advisers of the minister were to report to us in detail.

*Manpower and Immigration Council*

My impression, Mr. Speaker, is that this amendment is not consistent. It is not motivated and it is quite sufficient for us members of parliament—and speaking for parliament as a whole—to have each year a report from the minister who himself would be responsible for the good or bad advice supplied by his advisers and if his report of the minister based on the advice of his advisers or of the boards established to help him to administer better, is not satisfactory, the opportunity will be given us to hear it once a year, to criticize it and to put to him the necessary questions.

I think that in this perspective must be considered the function of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and the function of the members who want to question and find out what is happening within the department and who also occasionally want to bring up grievances. But I do not think it is reasonable to ask all the advisers of all the ministers of all the governments to report to us on top of that.

Besides, I have the feeling that under certain circumstances, their advice to the minister will be confidential. It would be unwise to publicize those matters, and hon. members would be the first to realize that there are cases, mainly with regard to immigration, which are confidential.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I therefore intend to object to this amendment, because I find it neither justified nor logical in the circumstances.

The hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) said earlier that he could not understand why some courses are not more readily provided. I am always sorry to disagree with him because he is a hard worker who is greatly interested in his constituents.

I have had the same experience in my riding. I found out myself that since education comes under provincial jurisdiction, the federal government cannot intervene if the province decides against selling those courses, to use a current expression, or if the province feels it cannot afford to sell those courses to the department of manpower.

I do not think that the constitution allows for federal taxes to be used for education purposes. I can hear the general outcry this would give rise to in many quarters, even if it were for as praiseworthy a purpose as that of giving courses to farmers or those who are in need of retraining.

I submit once again to my colleague for Roberval, for whom I have the greatest respect that he should try to set up some