

*Government Organization Act, 1983*

● (1610)

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on behalf of my colleague on this amendment as well. I think it ties in directly with the previous amendments put forward, Motions Nos. 2 and 3, I believe they were, in connection with the nomenclature and whether it be a Minister or Minister of State. They are all linked together and the intent is to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. This is a very simple change but I think there is some significance to it and that is what I wish to address my remarks to.

We are looking at the thin edge of the wedge here because, as others have pointed out, there is no control at all on the number of Ministers of State we can have. We have seen as part of Bill C-152 that as the number of Ministers of State increases, so can the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. During this Parliament there have been three new Ministers of State created, the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren), the Minister of State for Mines, and now the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin). That will give us three Ministers plus three Parliamentary Secretaries in the global effort in external affairs. On the other side of this Government reorganization Bill we have three more Ministers and possibly three more Parliamentary Secretaries being created. This leads me to think that there is a very real danger of looseness at the top of these particular Departments when you have six people who are in a very loose way responsible for different elements of the administration.

What concerns me, and I addressed this in part in my remarks on second reading, is that there needs to be a very tight administration of these Departments in order to ensure proper linkage, for example, between the trade effort and the industrial policy effort. I said earlier that the philosophies of the two Departments being merged were different. One was creating jobs, regional development, and the other was trying to take advantage of excellence in Canadian industry in order to capitalize on trade opportunities internationally. Given the merger, there is a possibility those two very worth-while objectives will be submerged, with the result that the over-all effort will be much less effective than it had been under two separate Departments.

We see the same problem in the Department of External Affairs with the trade function. There must be a very close relationship between the trade function and external affairs and the industrial development function in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Those two functions have been together, I submit, because of past relationships or friendships amongst the individuals who have worked together in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. But as the two are split and as time passes and people move on to other jobs, we will not have those personal relationships. For that reason there should be a very clear and tight administration from the top. Once we lose that, as will happen if we have three Ministers and three Parliamentary Secretaries, then we have lost that very valuable link which is critically important in

capitalizing on trade opportunities in very difficult and competitive international markets.

Let me ask another question, Mr. Speaker, relating to the three amendments of my colleague. Why do we need to have Senators as Parliamentary Secretaries? I have not heard this addressed properly by Hon. Members opposite. I might say that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley), who is a very critical element of this particular legislation, has yet to speak, and we have only 90 minutes of debate left. I asked the Minister as he was leaving the House today when we would get his side, his understanding of how he was going to address the problems Members have brought forward in a very constructive way in debate on this legislation. He said, "Not today. I am sorry, I cannot do it today". We have to have these answers, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have some understanding of how this enormous reorganization of the two Departments will affect us as Members of Parliament, affect the private sector, and what sort of policy will come forward in the coming months.

To get back to my point concerning the Senators, what has brought the Government to the point of expanding Parliamentary Secretaries to include Senators? Do we need all that help in the Senate? I am not aware myself, Mr. Speaker, of the Senators being run off their feet with activity. In fact, one of the concerns expressed by some Senators is that the Government has not involved the Senate to the extent necessary to keep them as busy as they would like to be. I am sure there are other Senators, particularly from the other side, who would be a little upset that I am encouraging a greater degree of activity there, but are we to infer from what the Parliamentary Secretary said that this is a very integral part of Senate reform and the Senate must be brought into the process to a greater extent?

**Mr. Epp:** Who said that?

**Mr. Wilson:** The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans). This must be viewed as part of parliamentary reform.

**Mr. Evans:** I said it could be.

**Mr. Wilson:** He says it could be. Why are we jumping the gun? Why is it necessary to throw another \$10,000 into the path of the Senators? Surely putting them in the trough until age 75 is good enough. Do we have to give them another \$10,000 or whatever it is to keep them happy? Are they not happy enough now with that sinecure for the next 20, 30 or 40 years of their lives? I would have thought that a Senate seat was enough. Maybe the Parliamentary Secretary can take us into his confidence and tell us about some of the problems Liberal patronage is having these days as the Liberals look at the 62 per cent figure in the polls. Maybe that is the problem, they have to pack some of these things in a little more tightly before the end of this Parliament.

Let me make just one final point concerning the signal this conveys to people outside of Parliament. Why do we have to broaden the number of Parliamentary Secretaries to include