

*Establishment of Industry Department*

will then be to foist ideas upon other departments of government. I suggest this is completely wrong and not only will be useless but could be disastrous.

I am going to direct the attention of the committee to a very interesting report which has come to my hand. It is a brief to the lieutenant governor in council of the province of Alberta on administrative problems of government, filed by the Alberta section of the Canadian Bar Association on January 10, 1963. It should be of interest to the speaker who preceded me that this follows another report prepared by the Alberta section of the Canadian Bar Association which referred to the proliferation of administrative boards, tribunals, judicial and semi-judicial agencies in the province of Alberta up to a total of approximately 200, I believe—far more than are found in the province of Ontario with four times the population and having dangerous implications with respect to the system of democratic government as we understand it. On page 10 of the report, section 27, the Alberta section of the bar association made this very significant statement:

The section wishes to state emphatically that the essentials of a policy to be administered by a tribunal should be stated explicitly wherever possible in the statute—

Of course, we have not got the bill before us yet and I may be quite wrong in the assumptions I am making, but having read the resolution and what the Prime Minister has said I doubt very much that we will find in the bill explicit terms as to the policies to be administered by this particular agency. If I am wrong I will be only too delighted to say so at the appropriate time, but I doubt very much that I shall be wrong.

The report of the Alberta section of the bar association was based in part on an examination of other studies which had been launched in England, the United States and Canada, in particular the Franks committee in England, a committee in Ontario which I will deal with later, the Acheson report in the United States and the Whyatt report in England. One of the reports upon which its recommendations were based was that of the committee on the organization of government in Ontario. In that report starting at page 10 I find some very interesting comments. It points out that one of the general principles on which government organization should proceed is—

—that related functions of government should be grouped wherever possible to limit the number of distinct or separate entities. So stated, the principle could lead into quite a lengthy discussion—

And so on.

The principle is stated in order to point up two dangers to sound organizational growth that are perhaps always present where executive responsibilities are expanding in the pattern we have noted.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

In other words, here is a categorical statement that when we attempt to divide various functions between different government entities, departments and boards, which functions could well be concentrated and dealt with under one department, we get into the problem of fragmentation which inevitably leads to difficulties. As a matter of fact, this report on the organization of government in Ontario was prepared by a committee under the chairmanship of the new Minister of Finance. I would certainly suggest to him that when he has completed his present arduous task he should reread it and do a little evangelical work among his colleagues. I think there is an ample and fertile field for him to do so.

As I see it there is the difficulty with this particular program as it is proposed. There is indeed a very serious and urgent need to do something to try to heal the very deep economic wounds on the body of this nation which have persisted for a very long time, but it will not be done by dividing the functions of the organization to deal with them among a number of different departments.

I suggest that we are not without precedent as to how this matter has been dealt with in other countries. In the United Kingdom it was the subject of a long and careful survey over a number of years. Commencing in 1936, I believe, a commission under the chairmanship of Sir Montague Barlow looked into the situation there which was, of course, aggravated in the pre-war years in the United Kingdom. The war intervened and the report was not made until 1944, I believe. In 1945 the report was the subject of legislative enactment in the United Kingdom. It is very interesting to note, particularly in view of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bow River and others, that the legislative enactment of the recommendations of the Barlow report was brought in by a coalition government. It took place before the 1945 election in the United Kingdom and at that time the wartime government under prime minister Churchill, composed of Labour, Conservative and Liberal members, was still in existence. Therefore I would imagine that the act of 1945, known as the distribution of industry act, was probably a synthesis of the views of socialist members of parliament and of those who believed in the principle of private enterprise.

It is also interesting to note that the act passed in 1945 has only been amended twice, once in 1950 and once in 1958. Here you have a situation where a coalition government brought in the legislation which was amended first by a Labour government. It was not a serious amendment, not one which destroyed the fabric and the enunciated purpose of the