

Just two days ago I was looking over the votes to come before Parliament and I noticed that this same vote has, by devious means, reached the astounding sum of \$250 million. In 1966 I might say quite frankly I was exaggerating in an attempt to create a dramatic effect, but we now see that this vote has reached the halfway mark of that figure which I mentioned. At that time, it was \$15 million and it has now reached \$250 million. To all intents and purposes, our control over Parliament and its daily proceedings has been very seriously weakened.

As hon. members know, we have changed the method by which estimates come before the House. It is very difficult now to debate the estimates of any department thoroughly because of the allotted time. The government is getting bigger every day. As I said a few minutes ago, it is not the size of the government which will help us out of our difficulties, but rather the quality. There is a danger in allowing an executive, liberally oriented, conservatively oriented or socialistically oriented, to have unlimited powers without control. The basic human desire for power and of an increase in power is irresistible. It is our job to reorganize government along better lines and to see that, instead of increasing the number of departments, we do everything we can to ensure that the departments we now have streamline their efforts from the top down. It is understood that the departments accept reasonable proposals from their ministers, but the ministers should keep their ears to the ground so far as their backbenchers are concerned.

Instead of setting up an even greater bureaucracy in every department with more and more experts knowing more and more about less and less, we should return to the good old, common sense days of Parliament. We have 265 men here who have been chosen at random but who represent the common sense and the good judgment of the average Canadian citizen. That is good enough for me.

I would go along with the presidential system if I thought anybody in Canada or anybody in the world, for that matter, had enough knowledge, integrity, application and the popularity to lead the Canadian people through thick and thin. History has shown that such a man has never been produced. In my opinion, the greatest leaders in history have been those who have been great enough to reduce their ultimate power by sharing it among men they recognized as being as dedicated, as knowledgeable and as loyal to their country and the free enterprise principles for which they stood. It is when such men are willing to share these powers, and when those of us who sit behind the chosen leaders have the courage to discipline them, that Parliament works best.

Monetary control is our only weapon. We must be able to refuse to pay these people who are not carrying out the will of the people. That is the only way Parliament can work. I will fight against this as long as I am here, and I will not preach to others that which I will not do myself. Any time my party seeks to subvert the will of the people by giving them things they do not want or by setting up power groups beyond the control of the people, I will seek a seat elsewhere in this House. I do not think it will be necessary to go back home to Alberta to preach

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

revolution and grow radishes—and I have grown my share of radishes. I have seen the results of the preaching of revolution. I should like to see a little more evolution in respect of our affairs. Perhaps we should even take a step backward toward the days when we believed in the very institution to which we belong, and to which we have sworn to dedicate our time and loyalty.

In a little lighter vein, let me say I was interested in the dream expressed by the last speaker of keeping the St. Lawrence Seaway open. A dream is one thing, but practical operation is another. If the previous speaker had thought for a moment he might have recalled that rainfall in Canada is marginal and if it were not for the wisdom of the Almighty in freezing up our lakes and rivers in the winter time most of Canada would be a desert.

The idea of keeping our rivers and lakes open all year has to be thought out very carefully. At this time we require a great deal of research before interfering with the nature of our rivers and lakes, the ecology of our Arctic, the wild creatures, and even the future of our forests, grasses and other growth. There is a need for research. In Parliament, a multiplicity of ideas are expressed and I believe an alert executive could pick out the important things, be they dreams or solid, well thought out scientific advice. No one man has all the knowledge.

● (4:00 p.m.)

I realize, of course, that I have been somewhat negative and critical up to this point. However, when I rise to speak I usually try to offer something positive as well. If we accept the fact that these ministries are necessary—and I have no doubt we will have them—I should like to suggest how the extra amount of taxpayers' money which is to be spent in this regard might be used. There are two ministries which are long overdue. I suppose people are thinking that, first, I talk about cutting down and then talk about creating additional ministries. I say that if we are to have new ministries let us exercise some common sense in this regard. We need a ministry of youth. This is not a new idea. Ten years ago I spoke at length in this House about the need for a department or a minister of youth. I believe the ten years which have elapsed since then have proven the need.

Every department of government in Canada, to a certain extent, is involved with the problems of youth, some deeply and some not so deeply. There should be co-ordination of the work of these departments. I do not think the pied piper approach will work as well as the previous speaker suggested. I believe the young people of today, if the pending federal election is held off for another 18 months, will probably have the vote. Most of them will be unemployed unless we do something about that problem. I believe a ministry of youth could well make this its number one project. There is the danger, of course, that people who are not in favour of the idea of a department of youth will say I wish to establish a Hitler youth movement. Far be it from me; but it is essential that the interests of our young people be co-ordinated. A great percentage of the taxpayers' dollar is involved in