

The establishment of the public security portfolio was, at the time, probably the most controversial aspect of the Campbell restructuring initiative. The common cry from our friends opposite was that by placing some immigration programs within this new ministry, the government was signalling a shift to tougher enforcement and a "keep the people out" mentality. The then Leader of the Opposition called this:

...a cynical manipulative move. The message sent out to immigrants goes against the traditional Canadian approach of tolerance and openness to immigration.

Of course, nothing could be further from the truth.

**Senator Lynch-Staunton:** Who was the Leader of the Opposition?

**Senator Berntson:** I believe the Leader of the Opposition at that time is now the Prime Minister of Canada.

This reorganization brought together under one roof functions which in the past had always complemented one another and allowed for greater integration of those functions. For example, customs officers have always played an important role at the border in identifying and referring people to immigration officers, and immigration officials have always relied on the support of people from the Solicitor General's portfolio to carry out their duties. Close cooperation is the key.

The Progressive Conservative government, as honourable senators here will recall, had recently set out its immigration policies in Bill C-86, continuing its commitment toward three key policy objectives: reuniting families, offering refuge to those who need Canada's protection, and selecting immigrants who can benefit Canada's economy. This did not change with the establishment of the Department of Public Security.

The new Liberal regime thought otherwise and hastily reverted to the old, original departmental formula of Immigration and Citizenship and Solicitor General. It is of course their choice, but I find it ironic that no sooner is the stand-alone immigration portfolio reborn than the new minister is bringing in the most restrictive set of policies seen in recent memory, striking at the heart of Canada's immigration system, family reunification, not to mention contradicting a Red Book promise of increasing levels to 1 per cent of the population. I wonder which government is being "cynical and manipulative" now? I would hate to think that Canadians were duped into believing that what was important in the field of immigration was not the policy itself but how that policy was to be delivered.

The second area of significant difference between the Campbell government and the Chrétien government was the advent of secretaries of state. On June 25, 1993, Prime Minister Kim Campbell announced that all minister of state positions had been abolished. On November 4, 1993, Prime Minister Chrétien brought them back with a twist. The secretaries of state, as he called them, would not be members of cabinet but would be members of the ministry and, as such, would be bound by collective responsibility. In describing the role of the secretary of state, a press release issued on November 4 reads:

The new position of Secretary of State has been created to provide additional support to Cabinet Ministers...

Secretaries of State will be paid 75% of a Cabinet Minister's salary. In addition to their staff as members of Parliament, they will have two special assistants and a secretary. All other support staff will be provided by the office of the portfolio Minister or by the department to which they have been assigned, as appropriate.

For legal purposes the Secretaries of State have been formally appointed as Ministers of State to Assist.

Honourable senators, it is my belief that the introduction of secretaries of state, or the reintroduction of ministers of state, is simply a shell game. Publicly, the Prime Minister claims to have the smallest cabinet in recent memory while in reality, with 30 members, full-time and part-time, he is nowhere close.

• (1520)

Prime Minister Campbell understood that a smaller cabinet would increase the workload for individual ministers. To compensate, she indicated a desire to increase the role of parliamentary secretaries. "Parliamentary secretaries will play a stronger and more visible role in support of ministers," states the press release of June 25, 1993. There is no role mentioned for parliamentary secretaries in the unveiling of the Chrétien cabinet.

My friends opposite will say I am wrong, that a secretary of state is not the same as a cabinet minister. However, let us look at the facts: Do the secretaries of state travel, as do their cabinet colleagues, on government jets? The answer is yes. Do they have access to government car pools? The answer is yes. Do they have the ability to play a role in the cabinet decision-making process? The answer is yes. Are they called honourable ministers? The answer is yes.

My last point, honourable senators, is really a technical question regarding the position of secretary of state. Under what auspices have these positions been created and how are they being funded? The press release of November 4 indicates that legislation is required to formally establish these positions. It has been over a year since their inception and, to my knowledge, nothing has been passed nor is anything forthcoming of which I am aware. Formalizing these positions would at least allow the government to introduce an original piece of legislation, not something which has been brought out of the past, drafted by the previous Campbell and Mulroney governments.

Honourable senators, you may ask what then is my point? What does it matter how many members make up the Chrétien cabinet? It matters because, while in opposition and now while in government, the Liberal Party and the Liberal government has taken great delight in extolling how they are so different than those terrible Tories. A Liberal government would be smaller. Ministerial office budgets would be slashed and the staffs of these offices would be greatly reduced.

Let us look at the promises and the reality: a smaller government? As already explained, with 22 full-time cabinet ministers and eight part-timers, the Liberal government can hardly claim a victory on that promise. Next, slashed office budgets and less political staff? An examination of the Main