comfort in building up a surplus. If they had kept the country in good repair we would not have nearly as many unemployed today. From what I have heard just one or two men ran the government and many of the Liberal backbenchers had no chance to express their views.

The hon. member for Laurier still expects to see the same number of departments in this country and the same number of ministers as there were in the Liberal regime when little was done, despite the fact that the same number of months is required to complete a greater volume of work. He says there are too many ministers. If the hon. gentleman would look around he would find that some of Canada's large stores have more departments than there are in the cabinet. What has happened to this once great Liberal party that has lost faith in Canada? Its supporters sell the Canadian people short; they have no faith in Canadians unless the Liberal party is in power. As compared with many large businesses which operate in Canada, the federal government would seem not to have sufficient departments rather than the contrary. I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to some of the firms which are operating in Canada and to the number of directors and officers which they think are required in order to operate successfully:

		Directors	Officers
Okanagan Helicopters Ltd.	(1959)	10	8
Imperial Oil Limited	(1958)	10	8
Polymer Corporation Ltd.	(1957)	9	6
Eldorado Mining Ltd.	(1959)	7	10
Sidney Roofing & Paper Co.	(1957)	8	6
T. G. Bright & Co. Ltd.	(1958)	7	5
Atkinson Charitable Foundation	(1958)	6	6
Trans-Canada Air Lines	(1957)	9	8
British Columbia Packers Ltd.	(1958)	20	9
Canadian National Railways	(1958)	8	53

Yet in the face of this it is argued that the Dominion of Canada, with all the tremendous amount of business which has to be carried on, has too many ministers. I certainly do not agree with the hon. member for Laurier on that point. I think the Leader of the Opposition has taken a second look at this question, and I am sure he does not agree with it either.

It would seem that the Liberal government did not keep up with the times, that it did not grow with Canada. Much of the unemployment we have today has arisen because the former government did not take action to build up this country. These big department stores, if they find that they have need of extra departments, make arrangements to provide them, and if hon. members will look at the annual reports of these stores they will find they invariably make money as a result of such decisions. On the national scale, whenever a new department is set up for the good of the country I do not see where we can lose.

Indeed, I believe we need still another department, and I would suggest that a department of tourism and recreation be set up as soon as possible. It seems to me—

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the hon. member that the scope of this debate is already wide enough without trying to establish another ministry. Perhaps the hon. member would stick to the point.

Mr. Matthews: I am sorry. I went too far ahead. I will not speak again on that question.

I noticed in my local paper, the Nanaimo *Free Press* of July 5, that there is some money to be spent in the constituency of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. The reason I refer to this item is because it certainly shows that there are plans to expand. This has to do with newsprint, so I do not think I shall be out of order. This item reads:

> This expansion, calling for a capital investment in excess of $24 million, will be completed in 1963.

That is, the additional newsprint machine at the company's plant at Port Alberni. I continue with the quotation:

> Mr. Clyne said that the investment demonstrated the continuing faith of the company in the economy of British Columbia.

That is directly forestry, and I assure the house it shows that forestry is a No. 1 industry.

In conclusion may I remind hon. members that the formation of a department of forestry will have a far-reaching effect on the economy of the whole of Canada. The constituency that I have the honour to represent will welcome this step forward by the federal Conservative government.

(Translation):

Mr. Samuel Boulanger (Drummond-Arthabaska): Mr. Speaker, when the resolution preceding Bill C-82 respecting the department of forestry was passed, several hon. members expressed their views about the services society is entitled to receive from that new department.

I do not want, in any way, to repeat the arguments of my fellow members with regard to the importance of the lumber industry in this country.

The creation of a department of forestry is justified because of the importance but more particularly, because of the waste, of forest resources, not only in Canada, but in the whole world, as FAO pointed out during its convention last September.