

*Government Organization*

whatever it is worth, was the Prime Minister's attempt to define the division of responsibility between the minister of resources and the minister of northern development in the north, on the basis of wet land and dry land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say I was somewhat amazed and somewhat surprised at this specious reasoning to justify a government bill which obviously has been drawn by some professional man in an ivory tower and without any knowledge of the realities of life. It is just as specious for the Prime Minister to divide that wide country on the basis of wet land and dry land as it would be for me to divide a cup of tea on the basis of whether one wanted lemon or one wanted it black. It is still a cup of tea and the north is still the north. Whether it is wet land or dry land, the winter is still cold and the problems are the same so far as the Eskimos are concerned. How are you going to solve these problems with more bureaucracy and a further increase in the cabinet without the actual implementation of policy or by having two ministers where one would do? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the best example of dereliction, this drifting between dry land and wet land. If anyone else but the Prime Minister had made this statement, Mr. Speaker, he would have been laughed out of the house.

The other matter, also, involves the minister of northern affairs and the minister of energy and concerns this question of water. It is somewhat of a paradox that this question of water in the only area where the federal government has absolute control, that is in the north, is going to be taken out of the hands of the minister of energy and is going to be left with the minister of Indian affairs and northern development. This anomaly and paradox again indicates the expanded number of questions with regard to the present formation of government, and indicates they did not look at cabinet reformation on the basis of policy.

How can you have direction and leadership on policy when you have 26 ministers, as this bill is going to provide? Let us take the country to the south as an example, and this is where I can agree with my republican friend from across the way. I appreciate the special problems of the United States, and their history of republican government. They may think we are confused and muddled up here, but we are going to be more muddled and confused if this bill goes through, and it is realized that the great country to the south

has only 12 ministers while we in this country will have 26.

Now, I grant you that they have their republican system and the ministers are not responsible to the legislature. But the fact is that there is this vast space in the United States and they have this fundamental civil rights question. We have a problem between two great races. They have a problem of area, a problem of people, a problem of cities, they have all the problems we have 20 times over, and yet they can rule their country with one half the number of ministers that we have in this country. I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) would find a lot of support, and I think a lot of members opposite would give their support, to a compromise between the republican system and the English system across the water, of getting a small inner core of cabinet and a larger outer core who could administer the departments.

When you compare what is proposed in this bill with what is done in the United States, and compare it with any board of directors of a large corporation like General Motors, you find that no company would have more than 26 directors. If they do have 26 directors, then they have an executive committee to do the daily administrative work or carry out policy. You cannot run a company with 26 directors.

The only other point I should like to draw to your attention is that I should like to hear from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hellyer). I should like him to tell us just how he accepts this bill on government organization when he is the great advocate of integration. He speaks of integrating the services, but they are disintegrating the government. In effect, Mr. Speaker, that is just what they are doing. I should like to hear the Minister of National Defence try to relate this bill to what he is trying to do with the three services which were here long before he was minister and which I suspect are going to be here long after him. There is a basic flaw in his fundamental belief if he can accept this bill because he has told us that in order to have an efficient organization with direction you are supposed to have integration.

However, he is the member of a cabinet that is trying to propound a bill that is going to increase the number of cabinet members. At least, according to the Prime Minister, it is not going to decrease the number of speakers—not speakers, sir, we do not need any