

*Government Organization*

through that resolution, Mr. Speaker, there would have been six departments included therein. Somobody boobed, and tremendous efforts have been made to explain away that boob.

With regard to the continental shelf, can you expect a minister who really only has provincial status in the federal government to deal with Russia on such a matter? We must have a strong minister who believes in a strong federal government. We must have a minister who believes in protecting the rights of the provinces within their own jurisdictions. Yet we have not seen any sign in this struggle between these two ministers, one federal and the other provincial, that the strong minister is being put into the federal portfolio; he found himself slid into a provincial status, and I am a little worried about this.

• (7:30 p.m.)

Many people in Canada believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is either the Liberal party or the Conservative party which is the governing party of this country. Many people in the United States believe that it is the Democrats or the Republicans which lays down the legislative basis for the government of that great republic. I think many people feel the same sort of way in France and in the United Kingdom with regard to their political parties. These four great powers of the North Atlantic must all be realizing that really the bid issue in this type of democracy, with governments so involved in the business of running the country, is just how much say the elected representatives do have. We must wonder, in this move toward having the experienced expert running the show, whether there is still not a place for the reasonable common sense of the layman who is elected to parliament. Surely when he becomes parliamentary secretary to a minister or a minister, there must be some little segment of power that he could exert.

After reading what has been happening here this last little while, I realize that we have not won the battle on behalf of the elected representatives, in this particular bill.

In the last speech he made in Canada, I think to the senior civil servants of Ottawa, Viscount Amery pleaded with the senior civil servants to leave some small segment of power to the elected representatives. He said he had carried out five portfolios in the Sir Winston Churchill administration in the United Kingdom. The same thing was happening over there, he said. Civil servants

[Mr. Hamilton.]

were so able, so sincere and so likable that it was difficult for a minister to go his own way. He said, "I ask that you senior civil servants give your poor minister some head, so that he can use his ordinary common sense".

In this legislation, I think, very few ministers will have the chance of using their common sense. What we are faced with here, I think, is a shuffling of portfolios to meet the needs of personnel available. We have no genuine reorganization, because there is no clearcut philosophy or principle of action apparent in the Prime Minister's statement on this bill.

[Translation]

**Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, looking over Bill C-178, I note that it concerns the organization of the government. That is the avowed purpose. But there is surely an implied or a secondary purpose which should be to insure a greater efficiency of government.

I believe this to be a step in the right direction. After listening to what was said this afternoon, I should not agree with all the criticism uttered. I wonder if some of the criticism was in order. Some ministers were personally taken to account. The question is simply whether the principle of reform is valid. It is good. It is not bad.

I believe that public opinion, parliament and some ministers of experience would have expected a basic, more drastic and revolutionary reform. That was expected by public opinion. It should be remembered that for some months, for some years now, Canadians on the whole have had a strange opinion of parliament and of government. I would not want to discredit parliament, nor cast the blame on Liberals or Conservatives, or on anyone else. Let us say that is the situation.

Canadians tell themselves: The Ottawa government is a heavy, cumbersome machine to operate; it is not very efficient, there is a lot of red tape. Sometimes, people are harsher and comments are more unfavourable.

In order to restore the prestige of the government, it would have been imperative to take the opportunity to carry out a basic, fundamental reform. Something drastic. As for efficiency, a study should have been made on the operation of large companies with thousands of employees and a budget as large as the Canadian budget, where responsibilities are delegated.

I would like to express, very briefly, my own idea as a newcomer, and that of the