

Government Organization

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, at any rate, I was about to conclude my remarks. When we study the bill section by section, we will then be able to consider in detail the matters we wish to raise. At that time, if we want to make suggestions to the Prime Minister who introduced this resolution and this bill, I think it will be proper for us to tell him what we expect from this government re-organization.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude here my remarks on the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Other hon. members have talked today about immigration, bankruptcies, etc., I wanted to draw attention to the organization of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources so that more consideration would be given to that field of the Canadian economy in order to get the results which the mining operators and the miners are expecting from that organization, from that Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

● (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Digby-Annapolis-Kings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on Bill No. C-178. I think two things are clear from listening to the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) this afternoon, reading the bill and listening to other members who have spoken. One is that the brave words uttered two or three years ago of "exciting the daring and testing the strong" could be paraphrased into "dividing departments and confusing the throng". The one other thing that is quite clear from the remarks of hon. members this afternoon and evening is that they want a change of the cabinet to conform to the practices and pressures of a modern society.

I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) was quite correct when he said that members would welcome a change which he said would give effective executive action. However, the problem here, and the great fear amongst many members on this side of the house when they contemplate the changes, is that the bill will not give effective executive action. Instead, the bill is just going to defuse, dissect and divide whatever action we have had thus far. I question the Prime Minister's statement that it is a first step. If this is a first step, Mr. Speaker, then the infant is not going to survive the muddle of misunderstanding and confusion to which this bill gives rise.

[Mr. Speaker.]

In explaining the point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson) referred to a shuffle. I believe that is the best thing that could be said about this bill, that it is a shuffle. It is a shuffle from a government looking for some direction to counter the conditions that have been so prevalent these past few years. The members do want a change. I can agree in many respects with the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) on some of those changes.

There are some members who may laugh about the type of change suggested because there is a need for having an effective cabinet, an effective government, trying to organize the business of this house and the business of the country. How can you effectively organize the business of this country when you, in effect, draw and quarter some of the departments we have here today. I am not going to deal with them all because many speakers have already dealt with the departments with which I was going to deal.

In so far as justice is concerned, you have a troika in that department. We all recall what happened in the United Nations when Khrushchev suggested a troika for that organization. This raised problems of the delegation of responsibility, problems of the implementation of policy. I suggest with the greatest respect that these men who are going to be part of the troika administering justice, are not going to increase the efficiency of this department. It is going to be confused by a lack of co-ordination and direction as between the ministers who are going to handle justice problems.

You have already had the problem of agriculture discussed, and that is important in my riding. This situation is particularly close to me because you have the Department of Agriculture and agriculture problems divided among the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Greene) the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp). We have again, Mr. Speaker, a divided delegation of power when one minister, with the proper delegation under that minister, could solve many of the problems of the farm.

The third problem has already been ably discussed by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) tonight. I refer to the conflicts between the proposed minister of Indians affairs and northern development and the minister of resources and energy. One of the reasons I was prompted to speak tonight, for