

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

With respect to farm production, does our present Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, in the manner it operates, benefit the people who come under it?

The more the government creates departments and, by the same token appoints parliamentary secretaries, the more it will have to establish royal commissions, etc. The more departments, the more public servants; the more public servants, the more "tripping", and less progress is made.

**Mr. Bécharde:** It is good for animals, it is good for sheep.

**An hon. Member:** There are enough sheep on the other side.

**An hon. Member:** Some are in New Zealand, and some on the other side.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Let us leave the sheep in New Zealand. Is it patronage-minded leaders we want or capable ministers? I said before, Mr. Chairman, that some members on the other side of the House can become excellent ministers and parliamentary secretaries. However, would it be profitable for us? We should know what we are buying, what administration is costing us, before we appoint administrators.

Since 1968, the cost of administration has increased by some 70 per cent. That's enough. With unemployment and with the tax collector stealing from their pockets, small wage-earners will certainly take a dim view of an increase in the number of ministers, of parliamentary secretaries, of civil servants, and in the cost of government administration.

I wanted to say a few words to call the House's attention to this oversize expense game. I wanted to say that I am against this bill, and particularly against clause 14.

[*English*]

**Mr. McCutcheon:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose everyone who speaks in this Chamber subconsciously worries about being original and about avoiding repetitious remarks. But I may say at the outset of this intervention that I make no apology whatsoever for being repetitious if that is necessary. I have no concern whatever about repeating arguments that have been made before, because it may take a lot of repetition before the people of Canada are aroused to see just what is happening. It may also take a good deal of repetition to arouse the innate decency of the government backbenchers. I am amazed at all this talk of obstruction and delay in connection with this piece of legislation.

The hon. member for Peterborough, in his intervention last Friday, mentioned that we had been debating this bill for 17 days, and another hon. member said we had been debating it for 20 days. Who knows? I suspect that both of them grabbed these figures out of the air, but even if it takes 37 days or if it takes 70 days it will be worth it, in my humble opinion, to delete this part of the bill.

It has come to my attention through scuttlebut around the hill that it is being said: what is the difference, the

[*Mr. Beaudoin.*]

government does not have any legislation ready anyway so we are really not holding up anything.

**An hon. Member:** There is the unemployment insurance bill.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Bring it in.

**Mr. Boulanger:** You are not the government. You had a chance in 1958.

**The Chairman:** Order, please. The hon. member for Lambton Kent has the floor.

**Mr. McCutcheon:** I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was going to refer to the fact that there are three particularly obnoxious clauses relating to ministries and ministers of state, and these are clauses 14, 20 and 23. I say to the government in all sincerity—because I think I am a reasonable person and I am anxious that some parts of this bill be enacted—that we should split this bill and only keep parts I, II, III and VII. If I am any judge of members in this place, I say that those parts will pass virtually automatically.

**Mr. Bécharde:** Why don't you vote, then?

**Mr. McCutcheon:** All you have to do is withdraw parts IV, V and VII and resubmit them in another form. I will then guarantee you that the bill will become law very quickly.

What is the crux of this debate? It is very simple. We on this side do not object to the appointment of extra ministers when it can be demonstrated that a need for these extra ministers exists. But what we do object to is the method used in this instance. Ministers without Portfolio can be appointed and their pay must come from an appropriation account. In other words, we have to scrounge around to find the money to pay them. What is wrong with that? If it can be proven to Parliament that there is justification for such an appointment, there is no problem getting that ratified. In his intervention the other day, the hon. member for York East pointed out that backbenchers in this chamber could not stop anything, could not do anything. Maybe he was partially right, but I submit that at least in such a case the people of Canada would know. They would be told why it was necessary to have another minister. That is very important in parliamentary democracy, but under this method salaries are provided by statute. There will never again be a chance to question why these appointments were made. We are being asked to accept this proposal on a take it or leave it basis, by one man rule.

• (4:20 p.m.)

What will all this mean? How many other ministers will there be? By how much will bureaucracy increase? Is this a bill to appoint five or six new ministers? I submit that because of the woolly way in which the bill is worded it would be quite possible for every member on the government side to receive an appointment. There is just no ceiling. So far, not one government member has come forward with a reasoned argument in support of this measure. I have been sitting here waiting for some-