

*Establishment of New Departments*

beginning of 1966, that the provinces have a responsibility in the economic development.

For that reason, the province must look after the organization of industry, labour and manpower. There should be co-operation with Ottawa, but the latter must not take direct action on manpower in a province, without co-operation with the province. Ottawa should be a kind of clearing house whose director would be in touch with the provincial minister of labour.

A little farther than the province of Quebec, we are aware of statements and attitudes on the part of representatives of British Columbia; for some months, the British Columbia minister of labour has been asserting that the province intends to stay master of its manpower policy.

If we look at the statements of persons who are not involved in political activity, we notice, for instance, that Mr. Roland Parenteau, director of the Quebec council for economic orientation, during the 21st convention on industrial relations, maintained that action in the field of manpower should be restricted to the province without, however, closing the door against the necessary co-operation with other levels of government.

Mr. André Raynaud, of the Economic Science Department of the University of Montreal, also stated at this 21st conference, on April 19, 1966, that an adequate manpower policy comes as much under provincial as under federal jurisdiction, and that manpower mobility was merely an intermediate step in the adjustment process of supply and demand.

Mr. Claude Ryan, editorial writer of *Le Devoir*, had this to say on February 24, 1966:

Political leaders are dealing here neither with words nor slogans, but with the livelihood of workers. It is essential to become very aware of the problems peculiar to Quebec and to prevent Ottawa from entering alone in a field of great concern to the provincial government. But the common good requires that the true aspects of the problem be first looked into, as realistically as possible, and that care be taken from the very start to prevent the whole study from becoming a jurisdictional dispute.

● (7:20 p.m.)

Here are opinions on manpower policy which are at variance in certain respects and consider matters in a different light. Is the federal government well advised to introduce a piece of legislation designed to set forth a manpower policy without giving us the assurance that all Canadian provinces have agreed on a formula which meets everyone's approval and which would be essentially beneficial to the working class?

To this question of manpower are connected matters coming under different jurisdictions. The matters involved include labour, unemployment, immigration, economic responsibilities, social aspects, educational training and even, in certain respects, civil rights and freedom. Thus it seems that the meaning of the word manpower, which is to become a national policy, comprises responsibilities which are recognized at times as being under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces.

This shows that the refusal of the central government to undertake a revision and constitutional reforms in a 1966 context continues to stir up and maintain in this country pressures and tensions which are neither good nor favourable to understanding and national unity.

As for this department of manpower, like in the case of the Science Council and other matters which I pointed out since the beginning of the session, the central government is going about the problem in the wrong way. These fields did not exist explicitly in 1867, they are not defined in the Canadian constitution—the question of manpower did not arise in 1867—it was not then an acute economic problem. Today, however, we are in 1966 and we must respect our constitution. If the governments no longer respect the constitution there will be complete chaos from the constitutional and even political point of view.

In spite of many requests from various members of the house and from all parties for the creation of an urgently needed parliamentary committee, so that federal legislators of both houses may state their ideas clearly on federal policy and responsibility in the economic, social and national context of 1966, the central government refuses and continually puts off the creation of such a committee which would be a first step—while for example the province of Quebec has already established a constitutional committee with the same objective in view—toward a national conference precisely in order to establish and define responsibilities. I am convinced that, from coast to coast, from Halifax to Vancouver, Canadians, even those who do not meet often, feel more like brothers and much closer when they do meet, in spite of the geographic distance between them. But instead of defining responsibilities, the central government continues to increase the constitutional chaos and to maintain tension and pressures on all sides.