

Government Organization Act, 1970

But there are already 29 ministers. The government also intends to appoint, under Part IV of this bill, 13 additional parliamentary secretaries.

In short, this bill will create 18 new positions at a high salary. It might be advisable to ask why, and I shall come back to this later on.

The second point I would like to emphasize is that because of the excessive number of technocrats in the federal administration, fewer and fewer powers are devolved to parliament in the legislative field, while more and more are granted to the creatures of the executive power, that is to technocrats or experts who are not answerable to the Canadian people.

Indeed, the more ministries of state and departments are created, the more power will be secured by the technocrats, the would-be experts who, unfortunately are not answerable to the people, so that the member of parliament wonders exactly what his role is in parliament, why he is elected; for, if the government is allowed to continue operating as it does at the present time, not only will the role of the member have to be redefined—which might not be a bad idea—but it will have to be discussed and updated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up a third point: thanks to the roster system set up by the prime minister (Mr. Trudeau), from 110 to 130 Liberal members will be given higher indemnities, indirectly, for some reason or other, and this without submitting to the test of public opinion.

Mr. Chairman, that is third point which we must not be afraid to raise in this House, because it shows us another aspect of the problem. But let us come back to the first one. So they intend to create 18 new posts. It is known that there is at present more than 29 departments and 16 parliamentary secretaries. One this bill is passed, five more ministers will be appointed; consequently there will be 34 ministers and as many parliamentary secretaries.

Why? Will the establishment of a ministry of state, a department or a Crown corporation be more beneficial to the population? Will five more ministers, five or thirteen more parliamentary secretaries do better justice to the Canadian population? Will a greater number of members with special assignments allow the population to take a greater part in the administration of public affairs?

Mr. Chairman, of course the answer is no. Canadians cannot take part in the administration of public affairs. I think that the government introduces this bill as an excuse for its failure in governing.

The other day, I dealt briefly with a comical situation which already occurred and which is so plausible that it might occur again tomorrow. Assume that there should be tomorrow a shortage of jobs for students, as it is already the case now. The government would be faced with a serious emergency from coast to coast. It would not know what to do with the young students. In fact, in 1972 for instance, there will be an additional 300,000 undergraduates on the labour market, not to mention the present unemployment problem. This means that this

[Mr. Fortin.]

government which has no solution today will not have any tomorrow.

On the one hand, the government is blamed by the population because it does not have any direct and immediate solution to the problem. On the other hand, criticisms keep on increasing because it has not solved the basic issue which is the monetary problem. It goes on following patchwork policies, suggesting makeshift solutions but does not settle the problem.

The latest gimmick used by the right hon. Prime Minister to cover up his lethargy and his incompetence is very simple: the widely-publicized establishment of a ministry of state and the appointment of some member who is yearning for a title, new powers or a pay raise. With a lot of drum-beating, this new ministry of state which will precisely tackle the problem of summer jobs for students will order inquiries throughout the country, as if we did not know that there are often problems in Canada. Studies will be made, commissions will be created under the authority of this new ministry, and public opinion will be entertained, not on the basic problem but on the surface problem, that is, publicity around this ministry, in the hope of keeping people's minds off the basic problem.

Mr. Chairman, we have 29 departments now. Is the situation better today than it was when we had 25? No, Mr. Chairman. There has been a lot of commotion in government since the Prime Minister came to power, but has the creation and abolition of departments, the changing of names, what I like to term this "fooling around", has all that solved the problem? No! In fact, the only result was to amuse some people, the Liberals, and not to create more justice, more freedom and more security for Canadians.

Mr. Chairman, we in Canada are not asking for changes in department names or in the number of ministers, but for an in-depth reform. It is not a question of giving numerous titles to people who are mad for power. On the contrary, one must forget one's personal interest and deal truly and honestly with the fundamental problem.

Furthermore and this is even more serious, administrative costs are excessive and constitute too much of a load for Canadians. The cost of administrative services is out of proportion to the income of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, on pages 21 and 22 of the booklet published by the Canadian government and entitled: "How your tax dollar is spent", it is said, regarding the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under "economic development and support", that for primary industry alone, administration costs—and not what industries are given to assist them—will be \$13.8 million in 1971-72. Last year, they amounted to \$12 million. In one year, they have increased by \$1.8 million.

One could find similar examples in the case of other departments. For the Department of Labour, administration costs will be \$13 million for 1971-72, while in 1970-71 they reached \$9.8 million. This is a rather considerable increase. Why? The Canadian people are still waiting and trying to guess.