

all the opposition questions related to whether or not members of his cabinet had seen the secret memorandum. That is not true. It was the answers of the ministers that related to this point, and not the questions put to the ministers. As if it were not bad enough for ministers of the Crown to use these tactics for purposes of evasion, the Prime Minister himself now contributes further to the smokescreen with his statement of today. What needs reorganizing is this government's approach to integrity.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** In this bill the government proposes the creation of up to five ministers of state who will be responsible from time to time for dealing with special situations as they arise. In other words, I suppose we can say that these will be ministers of state for contingencies. From the way in which this government handles contingencies, they could probably more aptly be called ministers of the status quo; their main role undoubtedly will be to maintain the status quo in the face of any situations which arise. It is a measure of the government's foresight that it is able to foretell that there will never be more than five extraordinary situations at a time which will demand the undivided attention of a minister. Never fear, however, because there will still be ordinary ministers of state and ministers without portfolio constantly on the watch for trouble from any direction—trouble, that is, for the government and its image.

Under the new system this will be an awesome government in size if in nothing else. There will be superministers. There will be first-class, second-class ministers and subministers; and I have not even mentioned the Parliamentary Secretaries yet. In sheer quantitative terms this will surely be a government to remember. This will be a multi-tiered government, and we shall all shed a few tears when we think of what it will cost the Canadian taxpayers who will have to pay the bonus of additional cabinet salaries to support it.

● (8:50 p.m.)

But in government and elsewhere it is not sheer bigness that solves problems. Evidently, however, there are more important things for this government than solving problems—jobs for the boys, for example. We know, or at least we hear, that there has been some resentment among hon. members opposite about parliamentary secretaryships. I suppose the sort of proposal contained in this bill is one solution to that kind of problem. Independent observers have calculated that under the proposals in this bill, during a normal four-year parliamentary term no fewer than 138 members on the government side of the House could be patronized in one way or another. That is something we would have to call a bonanza for obedient backbenchers. Mr. Speaker, there are more important things to do in this country today than to work out systems of parliamentary patronage for government members.

What needs re-organizing is the government's approach to appropriate action for these times. Whether the gov-

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

ernment realizes it or not, the use of the pork-barrel by government is no longer acceptable in Canadian politics.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Stanfield:** What does this bill do about the legitimate, the real, the urgent problems of the Canadian people? For example, what does it do about mass unemployment? The answer is, nothing. I call on the government to face up to its responsibilities to the Canadian people. I call on this government to take immediate action to meet the grave economic problems that face us. I call on this government to act now to get the economy moving ahead vigorously. That is the challenge this House must face. The Canadian people are fed up with waiting. They are fed up with constant organization and reorganization that leads nowhere. They are fed up with sterile structure-building, of which the present bill in many of its aspects is another example. They are fed up with confusion, with incompetence and with evasion. They want action now.

What needs re-organization is the government of this country and I am confident that when they get the chance, the Canadian people will look after that.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to express my views on the bill before us, especially as regards new departments.

I heard the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) saying a few minutes ago that he did not think any member would oppose this bill. I beg to differ on this point because ever since we have been here, we have been flooded with new departments and the situation has not improved for that.

The problem of the pension plan mentioned by the member for Winnipeg North Centre will not be settled by way of new ministries. This has not put a single penny into anybody's pocket, quite the contrary, this has resulted in the country sinking deeper into debt, in citizens being taxed more heavily and having to carry a heavier burden.

The government reaches abundantly into the taxpayer's income to establish new departments, in order to determine whether there are any problems in Canada. We know the problems, we know that the smell is bad in Canada, that pollution is everywhere, we know that the departments are polluted and that our leaders have pollution in their heads.

The situation is not settled; on the contrary, the problem is getting worse. We know what is to be done in Canada. The provinces know what they have to do to deal with pollution. The municipalities know that they must build filtration plants, but they have no money to do so. Is a new department going to solve the problem?

It is up to the Minister of Finance to solve the problem, with all the other people responsible for it. It is up to us