

for the revitalization of the whole of the Atlantic area. A simple example is that between 7,000 and 10,000 jobs would be created almost immediately on the construction of dams to harness the tides. Such a transfusion of employment would transform Nova Scotia from a "have-not" to a "have" province. It would probably do the same for the whole Atlantic area. I am sure this is one of the basic reasons the Premier of New Brunswick is anxious to have the report re-examined. In any event, the Premier of Nova Scotia says he does not wish it re-examined.

The taxpayers of this country have an investment of \$2,250,000 in the original report. I suggest it would cost far less to conduct a re-examination to bring the report up to date, so that Canadians might know whether the Fundy project is feasible, than it cost to bring about the original report. In view of the fact that the President of the Privy Council has a personal and friendly relationship with the Premier of Nova Scotia, I hope he will urge the Premier to take action to bring about a re-examination in order that we might in the near future look forward to a project to harness Fundy tidal power. In this way the people in the Maritime provinces would not have to wait forever and forever for such a project.

There is one other point I should like to raise. The power-hungry states along the eastern seaboard must soon decide where they will get power over and above that made available from Churchill Falls. The decision cannot be delayed, because this area of the United States is already facing black-out and grey-out periods. This places the utility companies in a precarious position. Even during the winter months these seaboard states are having to close factories and shut down offices because of power shortages. There can be no action in this regard until the Premier of Nova Scotia requests that the report be re-examined. Surely to goodness the Premier should explain to the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Canada why such an examination should not be carried out immediately. In other words, all Canadians should be made aware of the facts that exist today regarding the development of Bay of Fundy tidal power.

I now turn to the government reorganization proposals contained in this bill. At the present time we have 29 cabinet ministers, two without portfolios. When this legislation passes there will be four additional portfolios, which means we will have 31 departments of government. This is three times the number of portfolios held in the United States. That fact does not particularly concern me, and I might point out that the new Premier of Nova Scotia has cut down the number of cabinet posts. What concerns me as much as the idea of 31 ministers sitting around a table trying to decide something is that for some time there has been developing a stratification within the government of which the public has not been aware. If the government intends to set up an elite oligarchy, they should tell the people about it. If there are to be senior and junior ministers, let the government say so. We appear to be getting the proliferation of appointments of people in the Liberal party to an elite oligarchy charged with the responsibility of running this country in the way it desires.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Government Organization Act, 1970

Mr. Coates: This government has been running the country "well," Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Right into the ground.

Mr. Coates: Today we have the most unemployment in the country since the days which we call the dirty thirties. We have approximately 750,000 persons unemployed. The statistics for December indicate something like 535,000. Surely there must have been an increase of 100,000 in January, and probably another 100,000 who became tired of reporting to Manpower offices, were not qualified for unemployment insurance benefits and went on welfare and forgot about working for the next three or four months.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the department of the environment will create new employment. The establishment of more portfolios and more Parliamentary Secretaries will provide a few more dollars for a few more Members of Parliament, and nothing else. For some time I have followed the tremendous build-up in the super bureaucracy which this government has taken great pride in developing. It now sits as a further stratified layer between the cabinet and the Public Service of Canada. The only thing I can say about the 80-odd people in the Prime Minister's office who secure in excess of \$800,000 annually from the taxpayers is that they give damn poor advice. It is their advice the government has been following, and it has put this country in the throes of one of our worst depressions in this century.

We are getting a lot of flak from the back benches of the Liberal party. Whether or not the backbenchers realize it, they do not count because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has regional desks to advise him. Perhaps if the Prime Minister took their advice we would not be in the throes of a depression, but he does not pay any attention to them now.

An hon. Member: And we don't pay any attention to you.

Mr. Coates: It is too bad you do not pay any attention to me, because if you did you would realize you are nobodies. The Prime Minister said so in the House and he has indicated in his every action that you are nobodies. Mr. Speaker, it is good to hear the flak from these boys now, because I'll bet that when they go home they will receive a lot of it; more and more flak will be coming their way in the days ahead. They should stop and think, because if they do not know it already, if the Prime Minister has not told them—and if he has not told them, they do not know it—there is one thing as certain as life itself, and that is that unemployed people mark their X's and a devil of a lot of X's will be marked against this government when these people have an opportunity to vote.

If government backbenchers would like some non-partisan advice about the state of the economy at the present time, I have before me Richardson Securities of Canada Investment Securities Review for 1970. There is a Richardson in this House; I do not know whether he has