

Bureau of Economic Development, cabinet committees, and, finally, cabinet itself to be persuaded.

To my mind that is more than enough for the departments which are interested in particular groups and individuals to contend with. To say to these people that there is now to be yet another level of bureaucracy superimposed upon the departments concerned with ideas is just going to slow down the process still further. I feel that these 50 or 60 new bureaucrats the Minister of Justice talks about are just going to get in the way of social progress instead of advancing it. That is why I used the figure of speech I did about this being a beautiful package. The words are lovely, I admit. We are given a beautiful sermon about the government's intentions. But tucked in there is the authority of the minister who is to be the head of this particular bureaucracy to say no to pension increases, to say no to family allowance increases, no to training grants, no to veterans benefits.

In my view, it is an insult to a minister like the Minister of Veterans Affairs or the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) to say to them: "You may have your ideas but they don't count; somebody superior is going to do this work". It is not that I feel that way about the present Minister of Justice. A while ago we talked about years gone by, about 1960. The hon. gentleman was not here then, though he was trying to get here; I do not know what the young man was doing but I do remember meeting him very shortly after he came here for the first time in 1963, after I came back. That same year we met on one of those trips, down to Florida I think it was.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles: When hon. members get through having their fun, may I say it was a trip under the auspices of the Canada-United States parliamentary group and we went down to see the installations at Cape Canaveral in the days when they were talking about going to the moon as though they really meant it. The thing I remember most about my good friend the present Minister of Justice is that at that point the number of English words he knew was very few. When I consider how he came from almost no English at all in 1963 to his capacity now not only to speak in my language as well as his but also to debate and argue in it, he has a great deal to his credit.

● (1630)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: So much for the nice part.

Mr. Knowles: I say to the Minister of Justice—so that he does not need to be worried about what I said—that it was all to the good. Over there they never know when they should listen and when they should not. He should have been listening. I have his attention now, and I say to him that it is not that I think he is going to be a person who is going to lord it over the Minister of Veterans Affairs, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of Employment and Immi-

Social Development Ministry

gration (Mr. Axworthy), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne), the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), who is in charge of the RCMP, or the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox), who is in charge of many training programs, culture and so forth, but this bureaucracy is.

The minister says that this new bureaucracy will be comprised of 50 or 60 people. I did not know until today how many there were to be. I am all for jobs for public servants, we could not get along without them around here, but I do not see the need for these extra 50 or 60 public servants to do a job which is already being done by the Treasury Board, by the Privy Council office, by a cabinet committee and by the cabinet itself, and in the process really to say a few more "noes" to proposals for social development. I think that it would be far better if this did not happen at all.

This, as I say, is the reason for our taking our stand against this motion. I realize that, as so often happens, the government has gone ahead as if the motion had been passed. I listened, as I have already indicated, with a great deal of interest to the speech by the hon. member for Rosedale, but he did not seem to be very strong one way or the other as to whether he was for or against the motion. Of course, he was for it because they had the same idea last time. It is part of that envelope system. I just do not think that these things work. I think we will get a better deal for our pensioners, our veterans and all those who are involved in programs of social development if we leave the fighting for those programs to the ministers and departments concerned about them.

At one point the Minister of Justice said we could congratulate ourselves on the progress we have made through the years. That sounds to me as though he has heard the speech I make about once a month about the progress I have seen in social development since I first came here in 1942. I talk about pensions being \$55 a month in 1960. They were \$20 a month in 1942 when I came here, and there were no family allowances and many of the programs we have implemented since. That is fine, we can congratulate ourselves on what we have done; but we still have a long way to go, and I do not think we enhance the possibility of moving forward by setting up this 50 or 60-person bureaucracy to check on what departments like the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Department of Veterans Affairs are trying to do for the people they represent and on whose behalf they work. As I say, that is why we are opposed to this motion.

As the government so often does, it proposes something and then goes ahead and acts as if it has already been done. I noticed that in the *Hansard* list of cabinet ministers the Minister of Justice is already listed as "Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development", even though the ministry of state has not yet been set up. Apparently the bureaucracy is already there.

I realize too that we are operating under a statute which provides for a motion like this to be debatable for only seven hours, and then the House has to decide on it. With the Liberal majority and the Conservatives apparently feeling that they have to go along with what they were doing last time, it