

Perhaps when the Minister cannot get away, the Parliamentary Secretary addresses a meeting of the Liberal Association in a certain riding or the Chamber of Commerce or the Kiwanis. But that is hardly the sort of duty that fits the Parliamentary Secretary title. The Parliamentary Secretary should have a role in Parliament but does not. However, we are still being asked to authorize the Government to appoint additional Parliamentary Secretaries.

To this point we have been discussing Ministers of State and trying to transform them into Ministers. I believe it is rather interesting to note that in this list which I mentioned at the beginning of my discussion, there are ten Ministers of State within those 35 Ministries, of whom three have Parliamentary Secretaries. One is the Minister of State for Economic Development and the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Johnston). He has a Parliamentary Secretary. Another is the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Collenette), who also has a Parliamentary Secretary. The third is the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism (Mr. Smith). That makes three Ministers of State who have Parliamentary Secretaries.

What about the other seven? They do not have Parliamentary Secretaries, and perhaps that is one of the purposes of this legislation, to put them in a position to designate a Parliamentary Secretary, although I believe it is within the prerogative of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to decide which of the backbenchers is the most deserving to be designated as a Parliamentary Secretary to a Minister.

There is one Minister in particular, the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren), who is the last Member on the list of precedence. In many respects, he serves as the left or right hand of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). He is a glorified Parliamentary Secretary, in a sense, who can travel about the country to speak at the meetings of the chamber of commerce and other organizations with the cachet of the Minister of State.

It strikes me as being most peculiar that some Ministers are anxious to have Parliamentary Secretaries. I guess it is the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) who seem to be anxious to have Parliamentary Secretaries. If the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board wanted to have a Parliamentary Secretary, I wonder if legislation could be forthcoming, once the Government gets this particular legislation through, and it would use its majority to get Parliamentary Secretaries for everyone including the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board and the Minister of State for Social Development, both of whom sit in the other place. It would be a justification to have a spokesman here, but I should not mention that because someone might favour that notion to designate a Parliamentary Secretary here to speak for the Minister of State who sits in the other place. I suspect that if someone has that idea and will pass it along, the result will be that we will have more Parliamentary Secretaries. But, with all due respect, that would make a great deal more sense than some of the idiocy that is in this particular legislation by

*Government Organization Act, 1983*

creating another couple, at least two, more Parliamentary Secretaries in the area of external affairs, external relations or foreign trade or whatever you want to call it. I just lost a title for the Department for which I once worked.

• (1640)

I leave that thought with some backbenchers who are rather anxious or feel neglected that they might want to use this notion to be spokesmen for the absent Ministers or Ministers of State,—those Ministers who do not sit in the House and cannot be questioned. But let me warn any such Parliamentary Secretaries. They had better have some answers and not say, like a broken record, “I will take notice of the question and I will get back to the Member at a suitable opportunity in the future.” That is not good enough. A Parliamentary Secretary must have a definable role to play, and I think he should play it honourably and not use the title for the perks. I am sure there are perks. There are financial perks attached to the Parliamentary Secretary status. We are now in times of restraint, restraint of six and five that we hear about, which we now see on the stationery of the Minister. Here we are suggesting that there be not a six and five increase in the Members’ emolument by creating him Minister of State, but that it be considerably more than that. I leave it at that with those notions. I think it is a spurious operation. I do hope that we can get some backbone into Members on the opposite side to approve the amendments which have been put by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of my Party I wish to support the amendments put forward by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), that would eliminate those conditions of the Bill which provide that Parliamentary Secretaries can be appointed from the Senate and which increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries that can be appointed.

We are not opposed in principle to the idea of Parliamentary Secretaries. The principle, I suppose, is a reasonable one in that these Members of Parliament should be able to increase government accountability to the House of Commons, to the elected representatives. They should be able to answer in the House for the Minister when the Minister is not present. It seems reasonable that, up to a point, Parliamentary Secretaries can serve a useful function in that way. Also, being a Parliamentary Secretary serves as a training school for future Ministers. We recognize that, with the heavy load on certain key Ministries, there is difficulty of access. Theoretically, the Parliamentary Secretary can help improve that access and can serve as something of a troubleshooter for the Minister. I know, for example, that one of the former Parliamentary Secretaries to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro) did an excellent job in representing the minister in very difficult situations in which Indian people found themselves across the nation. He represented the Minister, helped in negotiations and reached certain agreements in good faith. Yet, when he came back and tried to implement