

only people it will benefit are those people who are great friends of the Liberal Party.

This is not a sound way, Mr. Speaker, to generate jobs in Canada. Today we have the highest unemployment in this country's history. We are going through a serious recession. We are not out of it yet. We need to remove the money from the bureaucracy and put it back into the people's hands. Grants do not do this. I maintain that tax incentives to individuals who may invest in the small, medium and large business are a direct way to get this country going. It will never survive through the grants system, Mr. Speaker, which is based on political patronage.

I have just one question, Mr. Speaker, and I will sit down. I would like the Minister, at his convenience, to reply to the Auditor General as to what has happened to the \$2.7 billion up to March 31, 1982, for which there is little or no accounting. This is something the Government did not finish before it started a new Department.

I see, Mr. Speaker, you are sitting on the edge of your chair, which indicates to me that I should sit down. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak on this Bill.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, in discussing Bill C-152 we have seen quite a bit of painting, or the use of a large calcimine brush, a whitewashing brush, if you will, on a very large brick wall.

This Bill looks innocent until you start to read it, and then you realize the implications of what is being done. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) participated in this debate and indicated that this is what the people in British Columbia consider his Party should contribute to the improvement of economic conditions and government in this country, both at the provincial and the national levels. Therefore, his rather intemperate remarks with regard to laying out your policy like a supermarket ad indicates the bankrupt policy of the New Democratic Party because it is still saddled with the Regina Manifesto of 1933. That is how they think.

In any event, what are the positions which have greater implications? I suggest to Hon. Members of the House, those who are here, that the amendments to the Financial Administration Act have a great deal more implications than ten times the business with regard to DREE. That legitimizes the present set-up for CDIC, that game of beans under the nutshell, "Now you see it, now you don't", depending on which shell one has moved.

Let us start with this Bill from the beginning. This is a re-organization of the Department of External Affairs. This puts the cap on what has to be the biggest bureaucratic empire which has been put together in the history of the Canadian Government. There is all of External Affairs, all of what had been Trade and Commerce, international commerce, and then on top of that you have what is known as External Relations. The ministerial part of this is a troika headed by a man whose impact on this country during the last three years has been the most disastrous we have ever known.

#### *Government Organization Act, 1983*

The former Minister of Finance was responsible for the fiascos of 1980, 1981 and 1982. This country was set back a generation by those budgets. But that is the man who is now being put back in charge of this troika. Then, for some reason or other, it has been decided that after 20 years Industry should disappear. I recall the time under the Hon. Mike Pearson when, with a great deal of fanfare, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce was established. The development of industry in Canada was added to the old portfolio of Trade and Commerce. The Hon. Bud Drury was made the first Minister. It made sense at that time and it seemed to work rather well. Then DREE was established in 1969. Well, I have known of a number of pork barrels to be created. I know, for instance, that the archbishops' palace in Quebec City was restored under economic expansion grants when the Speaker of the Senate was the Minister in charge of DREE. It was in his constituency. The Hon. Member can say what he wants; I can see him mumbling in his beard down there. But I saw the big signs.

● (1640)

[*Translation*]

Restoration of the Archbishop's Palace in Quebec City. Hon. Jean Marchand, Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

[*English*]

How many soft drink plants were established in various Provinces? How many plants to manufacture mobile homes? One was opened in British Columbia and one was closed in Alberta. There were no discussions with the provincial authorities, nothing.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pelletier:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) on a point of order.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member would not wish to mislead the House by saying that the Archbishop's Palace in Quebec City was restored by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. In fact, the present Archdiocese is not at all at the location mentioned by the Hon. Member. I am sure he was mistaken when he said that the present Archdiocese of Quebec City was built by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. The buildings concerned were historical buildings.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accept the correction or comment made by the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier). However, it makes no difference whether what we have here is the remains or the former site of the Archbishop's Palace. The question is, what connection is there with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which is concerned with industrial development? Is this supposed to help tourism in the area? Mr. Speaker, I think this is stretching things a bit too far. Let us not get carried away! In other cases, hundreds of millions of dollars have been literally