

Establishment of Industry Department

defence plants in this country. Certainly we want to see more of this done no matter what government is in power. Anything the minister can do to assist in this regard is something that we will applaud, and rightfully so because it will mean more work, more employment, more dollars in the pockets of our people.

What is a little disconcerting to me is that the Minister of Defence Production now states that they are going to try to balance off defence production sharing so that the United States will not have an unfavourable balance of trade in this connection. If this is the type of work that the present Minister of Defence Production is going to carry out as minister of industry, if he is going to try to see that more work is put into United States plants that could be done by workers in Canada, he is not going to be making much of a contribution either to the economy generally or to the aircraft industry of this country. If he is going to do it in some other way, I should like him to explain to the house how he is going to do it. I think it is most important for us to know exactly what it is he has in mind in this regard. The *Halifax Chronicle-Herald* in an editorial on June 8 indicated very great concern about his statement and I believe they should be enlightened as to his new approach regarding defence production sharing, as should members of this house.

I think the Minister of Defence Production should also take cognizance of the fact that this aircraft industry in the town of Amherst, which is very efficient and has highly skilled workmen who have done a tremendous job for many years in aircraft repair and overhaul, is in desperate straits to day. They are laying off men. We do not want jobs to evaporate. We want the problems to evaporate, as the Liberal candidate told us during the election campaign would occur. It has not occurred to date. Of course, there are a few days left in the days of decision. Possibly the minister can get a decision on a contract which this firm is negotiating at the present time with a United States concern in order to put our people in Cumberland county back to work through the firm getting a contract which they deserve on the basis of their efficiency. On the basis of the new relationship that the present government is supposed to have with our friends in the United States I would not feel it would be any problem at all for the Minister of Defence Production, either in his present capacity or as minister of industry, to eliminate this difficulty by getting this contract signed, thus putting our people back to work. If he does

so, certainly we will be very pleased with him and with his efficiency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have to go slowly in this business of setting up new departments, especially in this case where we have a similar department in existence today. I cannot quite understand why the government must set up a new department that is similar to the Department of Trade and Commerce unless they feel the present Minister of Defence Production is unhappy with his portfolio. Perhaps the government feels the minister is capable of carrying a greater workload than is his at the moment. You know, there is a danger of empire building in the civil service, and apparently there is also danger of it within the government. We have more cabinet ministers today than we have ever had in this country's history. If we have new departments we are going to have even more ministers. Perhaps this is an attempt to spread the work around so that as many of their people as possible have appointments of one sort or another and everybody in the Liberal party will have a position. As one of my friends has said, this may be one of the Liberal party's attacks on unemployment. Well, it may be, but I do not believe the people of the country are as interested in eliminating unemployment of this type as they are in the elimination of their liberties, their freedom, resulting from an expanded bureaucracy.

Certainly, the businessmen of this country must be sick and tired of the bureaucracy that there is today without facing any more boards and departments that seem to be in the minds of the individuals who compose the oligarchy in the present government.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit me to ask him a question? Could he tell us briefly at this point in his interesting speech what was done in the six years that his friends were in office to reduce the bureaucracy?

Mr. Woolliams: Some are sitting on the treasury benches, if that is any answer.

Mr. Coates: I am glad to have the question from the Secretary of State. I reply, I would say that the Glassco commission was not an example of an endeavour to expand the bureaucracy. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could request the President of the Privy Council to make some move to implement the recommendations of the Glassco commission. There might be fewer civil servants, but we would have a more efficient government, more efficient from the taxpayer's point of view,—that is if you are interested in those individuals, and if you ever get down to the level where you talk to them. I think that is