

contribute to the public service superannuation fund until the age of 60, at which time he can draw the full pension available to him on the basis of the number of years during which he has paid into the fund.

This is clearly a case of special privilege for a very select few. The only defence I can see anyone trying to put forward from the government side is that the government might want to possess machinery by which it can bring in deputy heads and turn them out again. I cannot understand why the government should want an arrangement of that kind. It will not be much of an inducement to an outstanding person to come in and undertake this type of job if he knows he can be turned out very readily. So this is a special privilege available to no one else. I can think of scores of cases where people have asked for the right to continue to pay into pension funds so they could build up their pension, but this is usually not allowed. Yet an exception is made for this select group whose number we can probably count on our fingers and toes.

I should like to make a comparison between the special privilege for such deputy heads and the treatment accorded ordinary individuals in the public service who retire at the age of 50. Take the case of a postal employee, a clerk, an employee of the House of Commons who at the age of 50 has been in the public service for 20 years. He can be forcibly retired on a pension of only 20 per cent of the average salary of his six best years. But a deputy head who at age 50, let us say, has spent only 10 years in the public service can go out into private business or industry, continue to contribute for the following ten years and become qualified at the age of 60 for a 40 per cent pension on the basis of ten years service but 20 years contribution to the fund. So the hardworking public servant who spent 20 years in the public service up to the age of 50 goes out with a 20 per cent pension, while the deputy head with only 10 years in the service gets 40 per cent at the age of 60. If that is not turning things upside down, if that is not being unfair to those at the bottom of the ladder and being unduly generous to those at the top, I do not know what is. These are examples of ugliness on one side of the superannuation coin which detract from the attractiveness of the other side of the coin. I earnestly hope that when we get into committee of the whole and reach part VII we can persuade the government to get fair play and justice written into this aspect of the measure.

I said there were two examples of coins which are beautiful on one side and ugly on the other about which I intended to speak. My second point has to do with the fact that on one hand this bill sets up a badly needed new department, the department of the environment, which I would say is welcomed by every member of this House. We shall have to assess what the department achieves when it gets going, but the rumours are that the minister who really has shown his concern in this area is to be the new minister of the environment and I think that even on the opposition side we can welcome the appointment of that minister and the establishment of this department.

Government Organization Act, 1970

It might be said, in criticism, that this step should have been taken long ago. But it has been taken now; we welcome it and it is good. I wish it could take effect right away. But instead of presenting the House with a simple proposition along those lines, something we could all welcome with enthusiasm, the government has put forward this ministry of state garbage.

Mr. Otto: Now, now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) says now, now. What puzzles me is that we are trying to clear up pollution on one hand, yet we are bringing in pollution on the other. If the hon. member for York East, who is one of the two Liberals who will not get one of these new jobs, would prefer that the government has given us pollution instead of this garbage, I do not mind.

I listened to the explanation the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) gave for the proposition concerning the five ministries of state. I shall not rehash what he said or try to put it into my own words, but it is clear that what is being presented is a blank cheque to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) by which he can create and dissolve departments at will without coming to Parliament at all. The only limitation is that there can be only five of these ministries at a time; I hope there is no need for us to anticipate a cabinet even larger than the 32 or 33 ministers we shall have under this legislation, not counting ministers without portfolio.

● (8:20 p.m.)

So the Prime Minister will have five slots that he can play with, five new departments that he can create. After all, this is what they are. Just to say that they are ministers of state does not tell the whole story. Under the legislation the Prime Minister can appoint a minister of state, make him head of a departmental establishment, give him a secretary of state and all the civil servants he needs to go with his new office. These new appointees will be called ministers of state of this, that or the other and they will be just as much ministers as those who are named in the Salaries Act: they will have all their rights and privileges; they will be members of the cabinet.

Between the things that the Prime Minister can do under this bill by way of proclamation and the things that he can do under the Public Service Rearrangement and Transfer of Duties Act, this will probably be the last time a government will have to come to Parliament for legislation to approve the restructuring of departments of government. The line that the President of the Treasury Board gave us was that this was efficiency. I agree. It is efficiency gone mad, technocracy gone mad. I happen to think that it is important to make governments responsible to Parliament, and you do not maintain that responsibility when you increase the actions that the Prime Minister can take on his own.

Let me tell the President of the Treasury Board, in case he is thinking of interrupting me to ask a question, that I am aware that he said Parliament will have the