

Government Organization

develop or regulate, are merely tools capable of being used for the public good, and capable equally of being misused. The department will have to grapple with the problems of the relationship between technology and sociology and of the conflict between mechanical efficiency and human individualism where nothing is black or white and where the best we can probably hope to achieve is a lighter rather than a darker grey. Nevertheless, despite all those qualifications, and imprecisions, I believe Canada has taken a long step forward in identifying the need for a Department of Communications. How effective a step will depend upon the department itself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is time for the opposition to start asking me questions.

[*English*]

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the minister on his address. I always like to read his speeches, especially those dealing with matters for which he is responsible as minister. In 20 minutes I will not be able to do justice to his 15-page address, a copy of which I received a few minutes ago together with a chart. Except for the fact that the chart was rendered illegible in stencilling I would have enjoyed studying it.

I congratulate the minister on his future exalted status of Minister of Communications. In passing, may I congratulate him for choosing an excellent man to become his deputy minister. I already know Mr. Gotlieb. In my opinion he is a man of outstanding ability and the minister is to be congratulated on obtaining his services. My remarks apply similarly to Dr. Chapman, who is an outstanding scientist and has brought credit to this country. I do not know so well others who will assist the minister. In general, I must say I have the highest regard for what the scientific community of this country has achieved in the field of communications.

I, for one, have no desire to delay the establishment of this new department because with it will come the establishment of important agencies like the satellite corporation. Creating that agency will be commenced more easily once the minister is finally ensconced in his new role. Since I am most anxious for the department to assume these new roles I will not indulge in any delaying tactics. Nevertheless, I hope that the establishment of the new Department of Communications will not be beset by difficulties similar to those encountered in the establishment of the Department of Industry some

[Mr. Kierans.]

years ago. Quite obviously, creation of the latter department was an error. I hope it will never again be necessary, as happened recently, for a minister to confess to wastage of half a billion dollars on regional development. I hope, and I say this most sincerely, that we are more ready for the establishment of this department than the government obviously was for the imposition of five-day delivery and attendant changes which were apparently insufficiently discussed and prepared for beforehand.

The Prime Minister spoke about the illusion of change. A cynic might say that we talk so much about the waves of the future, new techniques, new developments and new vistas that there is a danger we may create an illusion of modernity. What a word! I doubt that this is the case. At any rate, these questions come to mind.

I have read carefully the clauses in the bill dealing with the Department of Communications and I wonder how embracing and all-pervading the functions of this new department will be in the field of communications. The minister gave us a lesson in the first conjugation using the Latin word *communicare*. I wonder whether in this communications field the minister is to become Caesar or just one of the consuls.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I wonder what is in store for the C.B.C.? It would be very easy to have that controversial organization report to the house through the Minister of Communications. This would seem to be a logical development. I notice that the Minister of Communications will replace the Minister of Transport in regard to the Broadcasting Act. As time goes by, will the C.B.C. come even more under the wing of the nation's chief communicator?

I notice a small change has taken place in the allocation of subject matters and estimates to standing committees. The estimates of the Post Office and those of communications formerly went to the committee on transport and communications. In terminology at least, this is the logical committee. The Post Office, communications, and C.O.T.C. have now been placed on the agenda of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts. Is this a coincidence, a mere housekeeping matter, or is it portentous? This committee was always a normal arena for the Secretary of State, our minister of culture. Is he now going to become number two consul instead of number