

*Government Organization*

be made, under the Prime Minister's jurisdiction for the Privy Council, to look after the scientific secretariat? Will that be designated to a minister or will it stay under the Prime Minister?

**Mr. Pearson:** I am not sure if I understood my hon. friend's question. To what was he referring?

**Mr. Hamilton:** There is a secretariat that deals with scientific matters and handles reports from the new council on science and the National Research Council. I wonder if they will report to a committee of cabinet and from whom they will get directions in the Privy Council? We have been critical of this because it seemed to by-pass the house. Of whom shall we ask questions in the house? Will the jurisdiction remain with the Prime Minister or will it be given to a new minister?

**Mr. Pearson:** The proposed science council but not the research council will report to the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Starr:** I rise on a point of order. The Prime Minister mentioned that the Minister of National Revenue, in his capacity as president of the Treasury Board, would give a more complete picture of this reorganization. I wonder whether the Minister of National Revenue will rise now and augment the picture the Prime Minister gave a moment ago?

• (3:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that what the Prime Minister said was that I will deal with questions of a general nature which will arise during the debate. Questions with respect to new departments which are raised by hon. members will be dealt with by the ministers involved either on second reading or at the committee stage. Personally I believe committee stage will be more appropriate in that questions can be put and answers given, additional questions asked, and so on. Perhaps I should deal with questions of a general nature raised prior to second reading of the bill and its referral to committee of the whole after hon. members on the opposite side have had an opportunity to speak.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question? I do not see anything in the bill relating to this subject, but under the proposed reorganization will the traditional duty of the Minister of Justice to advise on constitutional problems be in

any way affected or is this duty being transferred to the President of the Privy Council?

**Mr. Pearson:** No, Mr. Speaker, there will be no change. Indeed, I quoted with approval the remarks of my hon. friend on the resolution stage of the bill on that very point.

**Mr. Brewin:** I am sorry, I missed that.

**Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, we have listened to a great deal of verbiage from the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) about what this legislation will mean in the reorganization of government departments and how effective this will be. All I can say at the present time is that the change is more an appearance than a result. Because it does not matter how much we try to reorganize or make the departments of government more effective; their effectiveness can only be brought about through the leadership of the government, depending in turn on the ministers who will head the departments and how effective they are in taking a leading role in the policymaking of their departments. Therefore, irrespective of the words I use we will have to wait with bated breath to see the results which are brought about by the changes being made through this legislation. If the performance of the present government since 1963 does not change within the next few years, then I am afraid we are spending a great deal of time on this legislation when the same thing could have been achieved by leadership in the departments which have existed up till now.

What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the effect that this legislation will have on certain departments of the government and the demoralizing effect it has already had in relation to the proposed new departments and their effectiveness. In some instances this legislation relegates certain departments, which have been doing a good job heretofore, to a very unimportant role. Others are raised in importance, depending on who is the minister designated to head them. I am not going to speak about who the ministers will be; rather, I should like to say a few words about the departments themselves, their significance and their effect upon the people who will staff them.

I should like to say a few words first about the Department of Labour over which I presided as minister for five and a half years. In 1957 the Department of Labour was considered a poor second cousin to all other