

members opposite hope that he will come up with the required miracles, but it is an impossible task.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Alexander: Because of the alienation, frustration, disgust, despair, fear, hopelessness, insincerity, and lack of confidence in the present administration. I am looking at the government House leader. He knows that I speak sincerely. The lack of confidence in the administration under which Canadians are living is too deeply rooted, because incompetence and mismanagement are the hallmarks of the present administration.

Bill C-35 is entitled as follows:

An act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto.

It is misleading, but it could have been laudable and commendable if the portion reading "and matters related or incidental thereto" could have been interpreted as dealing with the reorganization of the government's attitude, thinking and initiative. In my view, such a reorganization would reduce and minimize the suffering and hardship which stem from high unemployment, high inflation and no growth. Reorganization by itself is not earth-shaking and it is not a panacea. The end result is what is important. In other words, what does the government intend to accomplish by reorganization? More important, in what direction must the government go in order to bring about a policy or principle for the benefit of Canadians?

Other than the sections dealing with fisheries and the environment, the bill is relatively silent. We want to see it go before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry in order to find out what is going on in the reorganization sector of the government. In the past the government's view regarding reorganization has been the solution rather than a first step toward the solution and/or solutions. I should like to put on record a few examples respecting reorganization which perhaps have been stated before. I should like to present five examples for the edification of the House.

First, in 1971 the department of fisheries and forestry was submerged in a new department of the environment. In 1974 the minister of state was given fisheries responsibilities within the department of the environment. In 1976 the department attempted reintegration under the name of the Department of Fisheries and the Environment and only one minister. The current minister intends to create a separate department of fisheries and oceans, with the department of the environment going its own way. By going through no less than four reorganizations, the federal management of these policy areas has returned to an organizational status remarkably similar to that prevailing prior to 1971. It is a sort of turnabout.

The second example deals with the ministry of state for urban affairs. The Ministry of State for Urban Affairs was created in 1971 to respond to accelerating urbanization and its resulting problems. Although no one could claim these problems have been solved, the ministry will be disbanded within

Government Organization

approximately six months. Both urbanization and its resulting problems remain; it is the organization which changed.

The third example involves the Ministry of State for Science and Technology, also created in 1971. In addition to the development of federal policies on science and technology, the ministry was directed to co-ordinate existing federal science policies. While such policy development and co-ordination is no less urgent today, in its seven-year history the ministry has had six ministers, three of whom have had other ministerial responsibilities. When we think of the word "reorganization", we must determine the aims and the direction the government intends to pursue in order to bring about a policy and principle for the benefit of Canadians.

The fourth example deals with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It was reorganized in 1977 to create the enterprise development program, which was designed to co-ordinate distribution of all the department's industrial support funds. The enterprise development program now distributes a lesser amount of money than the sum distributed by its predecessors.

The fifth example involves the office of the comptroller of the treasury which was disbanded in 1969. The comptroller's duties included management of disbursements from consolidated revenue, provision of accounting services and the preparation of cash forecasts. In 1978 the government created the office of Comptroller General allied with the Treasury Board. His duties include the development of expenditure control systems and related administrative practices. The two comptrollers' job descriptions are sufficiently similar to raise a question as to whether the government has once again reorganized itself back to where it started.

Last but not least, we have the big "super minister". I think of him as being the former minister responsible for the Treasury Board. I had occasion to shadow him with some success when he was involved with immigration, labour, manpower and unemployment insurance. Now we have a big super minister who will somehow or other rescue the government from the perils which it faces every day. I wonder what the priorities of the government are.

Mrs. Sauvé: We do not have any.

Mr. Alexander: I hear an hon. member opposite indicating that they do not have any. I am the first one to agree with that.

Mr. Paproski: That was said by the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé).

Mr. Alexander: Was that the Minister of Communications (Mrs. Sauvé)?

Mr. Beatty: Yes.

Mr. Alexander: It should be documented and recorded that they have no priorities. I will pretend I did not hear that and let it go by the board.

Mr. MacEachen: The minister withdraws that remark.