

As regards the Department of Transport and Communications, its administration will cost over \$29.8 million in 1961-1972. The expenditures of the same department totalled \$23 million last year, which means they have increased by \$6.8 million in one year. Is this in order to give better service to the Canadian people? No, Mr. Chairman, but in order to give greater authority and better working conditions to technocrats, and to increase the number of officials who pester people with all sorts of inquiries and plans.

As far as the internal overhead expenses of the government are concerned, it is mentioned that the government cannot foresee the correct amount. The exact wording is as follows:

Contingencies Vote

What does it mean? Without trying to understand, Mr. Chairman, let us be content with what is said.

**Mr. Béchard:** This is a far-sighted government.

**Mr. Fortin:** It reads as follows:

Contingencies Vote

Seventy-five million dollars are provided for unforeseen spending and salary increases. Last year, the amount was \$63 million or \$12 million less. Perhaps those figures are not sufficiently eloquent. Here is what we read with regard to "General Government Services":

Legislative—salaries, operating costs of Parliament, election expenses and Auditor-General—

Those items will cost \$36.1 million in 1971-72. This cost \$32.3 million last year. This is an increase of \$4 million.

The collection of taxes is a very interesting aspect.

● (3:20 p.m.)

On page 27 of the same brochure it is said and I quote:

National Revenue—costs of collecting taxes—

Does anyone know how much it cost to collect taxes from the Canadian taxpayer and pay technocrats during 1971-72? The cost was \$184,300,000. For the previous year, in 1970-71, the cost was \$164,500,000, that is an increase of more than \$20 million in one year.

Mr. Chairman, there is no point in proceeding any further with this demonstration to prove that the government believes that it does not have to serve the people.

Mr. Chairman, it seems the government feels it is its duty to serve the technocrats, the civil servants, for its own purposes but not to serve the Canadian people or parliament.

On page 18 of the same publication are printed the words of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), who is sitting in front of me but not listening to what I have to say, and I quote:

The government does not necessarily have to spend vast sums of money in order to meet its policy objectives.

That is a little too strong, we have to admit. In that booklet, the government states that it does not necessarily have to spend vast sums of money for the people. At the same time, he introduces bill C-207, asking for a free

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

hand to establish, at his discretion, five ministries of state, without telling us what field they will be covering, without telling us what their relationship with parliament will be, taking power away from parliament to increase the power of technocrats and the executive. In fact, while the government is about to appoint sixteen more parliamentary secretaries, here is what it tells us:

The government does not necessarily have to spend vast sums of money in order to meet its policy objectives.

That is an insult to the Canadian people. It is the government's constitutional right to levy taxes from taxpayers, but it is also its duty to provide services commensurate with the taxes levied.

The same government says that it is entitled to levy taxes but without being obliged to spend for the people. That is the ridiculous situation in which we are now.

Last week I mentioned the increasingly decisive influence of technocrats on the government.

Mr. Chairman, I have very interesting statistics that can be found on page 19 of the publication of the Treasury Board, and I quote:

There are two ways to look at the overall spending program—one by department and the other by the objectives or functions being served. The Blue Book necessarily sets out amounts for each of the 80-odd Federal departments and agencies,—

Mr. Chairman, "80-odd departments and agencies" are presently heading this government, directly under the executive power. To hear our opposites, this would not be enough to administer the country. This means enormous administrative costs which drain revenue and prevent a really efficient administration, because we are tripping over technocrats and this does not make sense. The situation is now reaching gigantic proportions and is really ludicrous.

This is why I so fiercely oppose the passing of this clause 14, inasmuch as it is a direct attack against the powers of parliament.

This clause states that "the Governor in Council may, by proclamation, establish a Ministry of State for that purpose". Last week, I proposed an amendment stating that instead of the Governor in Council being able, by proclamation, to establish a ministry of state, it would be done by the Canadian parliament may through legislation.

I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board why the establishment of the 29 other departments had to be submitted to parliament and approved by legislation, whereas the government now forgets this constitutional right and would willingly let the Prime Minister establish whatever departments he wishes in fields of his choice without submitting such projects to parliament. That is senseless. That again is prejudicial to the rights of parliament.

The choice we have to make today is not an easy one, but it is clear. Either we shall continue to abuse the system, increase the number of departments, Crown corporations and ministries of state, grant powers, pay salaries and give titles to technocrats, who will abuse such powers without being responsible to the people, or we