

sole preoccupation has been to review its policies. To do so, it hires commissioners-inquirers who review the policies of the various services and departments, which finally leads to the publication of white papers. And we know at what rate those task forces, those Royal commissions of inquiry, those organizations and reorganization plans have proliferated.

Now, today, Mr. Speaker, with much fanfare, the government introduces a bill of the package-deal type, containing more than 12 different proposals that, according to the Appendix, are related to more than 15 different acts. Hon. members will have to vote for or against the whole bill as if it were or should be the instrument that will save the nation from the problems it is facing.

The bill seeks to create a Department of the Environment, to make small changes within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, to create ministries to be headed by Ministers of State who will get \$15,000 a year over their normal salary.

When we keep on reading, we find out that the intention is to have as many Parliamentary Secretaries as there are departments and to re-establish the Post Office Department—where there have been five Postmasters General in ten years—to increase pensions while old people are oppressed and the unemployed are told: Starve, tighten your belt, wait till you are 65 years of age to draw your pension.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the bill is not only sickening, but shows clearly that the government instead of establishing a just society is endeavouring to establish one where public funds will go to a privileged class, to some all-powerful and greedy officials, at the expense of the public.

This bill becomes the favourite tool or weapon of the government to reward supporters who have become useless or too old.

Mr. Speaker, it is a means like another to keep those individuals from doing their duty and to make them toe the line with the promise that they will be remembered later.

Finally, what changes will the bill bring? We are told, in the first place, that it will create a Department of the Environment. This department, according to the President of the Treasury Board, is to deal with pollution.

But, Mr. Speaker, after hearing his speech, I read a small newspaper article which said much and which appeared in *La Presse* on January 26, 1971. It is entitled: "No to affluence is the price of pollution control".

May I be allowed, for the information of my hon. colleagues, to quote brief excerpts from it. It says:

"Canadians will have to give up affluence to pay the cost of fighting pollution," said last night the Chairman of the Bank of Montreal, Mr. G. Arnold Hart. However the public must be cautioned against the sudden passing of ill-advised legislation".

● (9:30 p.m.)

The quotation continues as follows:

And that is where the problem lies. According to the banker, any effort to combat pollution will result in economic restraints, but he added that "it is much too easy a temptation to wish the people responsible for pollution to bear the cost of the fight against pollution."

Government Organization Act, 1970

Mr. Speaker, is there anything more absurd than the excerpt I have just read? This banker who enjoys the protection of governments for unduly increasing his profits at the expense of the Canadian population, who can lend 14 times each dollar deposited in his bank, who has enjoyed the protection of governments and who controls them, now tells the Canadian people at the time when the minister announces the establishment of a Department of the Environment that the invoice for this fight against pollution will have to be paid by the population. In turn he repeats after the governments: Tighten your belts, starve, as we do not have the money for this fight.

Mr. Speaker, that banker makes one forget wherein lies the problem. He shifts it completely and tells the public: You will, once again, have to pay the price.

There is no doubt that the problem of pollution in Canada is very serious. Because we have been remiss in the past, we cannot delay further its solution. Nevertheless, with the establishment of this department, the government is trying today to make political capital. Because it is dishonest, because it plays with people's votes, and with their pocketbooks, it does not say how it will meet the costs of this fight.

Government members make bombastic speeches, but they do not explain how the costs of this fight will be met. On the contrary, the government is following the same policy as bankers who say: The people will have to tighten their belts; they will have to pay the bill, to starve and keep on depriving themselves, because governments kotow to high finance.

That is the most absurd situation it is possible to find in a government, namely that the government is in the power of high finance and, at the same time, it distracts the people with a so-called policy of grandeur.

Mr. Speaker, remember where a policy of grandeur, leads to. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talked about fighting inflation; we saw him on television and we heard him say, with a quiver in his voice, that the only problem in Canada was inflation.

People were told: Tighten your belts, do not raise salaries by more than 6 per cent, deprive yourselves. Older people who were out of work and were not yet entitled to the old age pension were told: Wait until you are 65 years of age. Tighten your belt a little, good times are just around the corner. Young people were told: Go to school, get diplomas, tomorrow you will have a happy society where you will find a place for yourselves.

Mr. Speaker, where do such incisive formulas and this anti-inflationary policy of greatness lead us, with the appointment of agencies like the Prices and Incomes Commission with which to deceive people floundering in the system, when their only concern is to get votes.

That does not solve anything. It is a policy of band-aids on wooden legs and we see today that the fight launched against inflation resulted in uncontrolled and uncontrollable unemployment.

What is the result of this omnibus bill that contains 35 or 40 different provisions which, in the end, settled absolutely nothing? People are amused with these matters