

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

Why? Is it because large companies have too much influence upon governments? Is it because they supply too much money to campaign funds?

Now, the department will devise cleaning up programs, in order to fight pollution. Again this is going to be paid for by poor workers in the form of taxes. These big companies, which are responsible, are not going to pay, and this is why I wish to warn the minister. They are the real polluters. Indeed I heard someone say a few days ago that those who will pay will necessarily be the taxpayers.

Well, I say no. In these serious instances of pollution, the taxpayers should not pay, but the government should coerce these companies into undoing the damage they have done to our waters.

We are also confronted with pollution caused by the accumulation of garbage in cities. The government should consult with municipalities in dealing with this problem. As a matter of fact I spoke about it this afternoon to the officials of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to try and attract the attention of the government on the need to pass legislation and regulations to urge municipalities to discharge their sewers elsewhere but not in our waterways, and thus control the present situation.

I am sure that the future minister will arrange meetings with the provincial authorities. In fact, the provincial government will always be involved and it is a touchy operation—especially in the province of Quebec—for federal members to “swing a leg over the fence” as people would say. These will have to be contacts with the provincial authorities and joint programs will have to be developed so that every municipality will feel the obligation to comply with certain regulations designed to cleanse our rivers and streams.

We are told that it is too late, but better too late than never. If we fail to take action within the next decade, in my area, I am convinced that not a single fish will survive. We may have the most beautiful lakes and rivers, but all of them will surely be spoiled due to the nearsightedness of our governments.

The municipal authorities are certainly not able to solve this problem alone and I know the minister is convinced of that. That is why, besides establishing the department, the minister should take care not to imitate other ministers by merely creating committees charged with the responsibility of doing the work for him. He should take direct action and suggest concrete programs to be carried out immediately.

Then, we will be able to say that we really have an active and a progressive department. As far as pollution is concerned, there is no time to lose, I think.

Now, I am turning to the second part dealing with Energy, Mines, Resources and Technical Surveys, which will include hydro-electric power. Here is a problem that is likely to cause many headaches to the federal government when the time comes to make arrangements with the government of Quebec and other provincial governments.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

● (8:50 p.m.)

I hope this task will be carried out quickly and, as far as I know, there is no reason why the provincial governments should object to the federal government's proposals for joint action in this field.

As regard Part III, namely the National Research Council, we agree with the clause transferring responsibility for astronomical observatories to the National Research Council. We can only commend the minister for dealing with this matter which, I believe, falls under federal jurisdiction.

With Part IV of the bill, we are really coming to the crunch of the matter. We have been told in Part III that three new ministers of State would be appointed. That will make five. When the Prime Minister is asked about the reasons for this government reorganization, the answer can be found in the January 27 issue of *La Presse*, and I quote:

The federal government intends to set up new ministerial duties in order to face “emergency matters”.

Mr. Speaker, I really wonder about these “emergency matters”. The only “emergency matter” that I can see in the creation of these new puppet departments and the appointment of new ministers of State is an attempt to please as many people as possible. I think the appointments could give the Prime Minister quite a headache. Considering the size of his representation, everybody will probably want to have cabinet post. And since there are simply not enough posts available, why not make up a few extra ones. But this is done at the taxpayers' expense. He will appoint five ministers of State who will receive \$15,000 in addition to their salary. Moreover, he will appoint 18 parliamentary secretaries with a \$4,000 gift to each of them.

**An hon. Member:** It is not 18.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I am told it is not 18 but 16. If we figure the expenses that would result from the appointment of five new Ministers of State, 36 or 38 parliamentary secretaries, 18 committee chairmen, one whip, one assistant whip, we may well wonder where this will lead us to. We realize that in the end everybody will be happy, everybody will be rewarded, everybody will have his piece of pie. But in order to please everybody, it will cost one billion dollars more to this country. We forget that. That is why I cannot logically and sincerely approve the provision of this bill providing for the appointment of Ministers of State and parliamentary secretaries.

A bill dealing with this particular subject would be very interesting. I wish I knew the result of a vote on bills of that kind. But what happens? It is hidden inside the cake so that we might be led to swallow it. However, we shall not, even at the risk of being told by our electors, as often happens when we vote against a bill: You voted against the bill on pollution. But nobody will suggest that this bill features other kinds of pollution—salary pollution, gift pollution and political pollution! This is why I can not support it.