

of the government of Canada was only a fraction of what it is today, may have seemed important but which certainly are not important when compared with other issues which have to be decided by the cabinet today. One which I came across just in the last week or two illustrates, as well as anything can, the type of thing which has now been referred to treasury board rather than to the governor in council for action. Under one of the earlier pension or superannuation schemes here the recipient had the right to either take his pension in instalments or to commute it into a sum. Under the original legislation his decision, if he chose to take it in a sum, had to be confirmed by an order in council. I do not think any of us here today think the cabinet of Canada has so little business that the giving of approval to a man's own decision as to how to take his pension is a matter which should engage their attention. The section referred to by the hon. member will, I think, do a great deal to remove a load of unnecessary trivia from the shoulders of the cabinet.

The hon. member mentioned section 7 (d). I was just thinking of the difference between the opinions expressed on this section by him and by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. But as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated, I rather think he was referring to section 7 (d) (i) rather than section 7 (d). It gives authority to encourage employees in the public service to advance constructive ideas on how to effect economies. In this regard I think those of us who are actually in the departments carrying out the daily duties of government are perhaps in a good position to see where savings—perhaps just small ones but nevertheless savings which in the aggregate will be substantial—can be effected. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out in his thoughtful speech on the resolution the other day, such a practice has been useful in the United States.

Mr. Knowles: It is good for morale as well.

Mr. Sinclair: And it is good for morale as well, as the hon. member points out.

Mr. Fraser: It is used in industry.

Mr. Sinclair: It is used in industry, which has found it to be a useful practice. The hon. member at the same time mentioned section 22. Under that section, of course, power to remit taxes or other revenues is not transferred to the treasury board. That is still a matter for decision by the governor in council.

I am sure that the clauses on revolving funds are going to get thorough discussion

when they come before the committee. A year ago we had a protracted debate here on the bill of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier) establishing the first such a revolving fund. With that discussion under our belts, I think we will be in a better position to understand what is aimed at. I think the principal aim of these provisions for revolving funds is to establish a uniform policy across all departments so that we will understand what is government policy in any department as far as revolving funds are concerned.

The crown corporation section is, I think, undoubtedly the most interesting one and it is also, I think, the section which gave the greatest problems to those who drafted the bill and those senior officials in the various branches of government who were consulted in the drafting. The crown corporations do not fall easily into any one category. This spread which we have between government departments at one end and the companies which are public from the fact that they are owned by the crown but are operated much as a private business corporation, such as Polymer, at the other end, spans the field in crown corporations. Obviously the form of parliamentary control which will be exercised over the crown corporation which is in essence merely an extension of a department of government is entirely different from the control which you would expect to be exercised over what is, in many respects, an independent business operation competing with other privately owned businesses in the same field. That has been the aim of this legislation; and I am sure it will receive careful attention. No doubt when we come before the committee the question of whether or not these various corporations are in their right categories will receive discussion.

The hon. member for Greenwood pointed out this interesting point which I was quite sure some hon. member would raise with respect to section 77, as to the Auditor General's responsibilities in auditing crown corporations. Some years ago as a private member I made a speech on the fact that I thought that the Auditor General should do the work on the C.N.R. I was quite sure that in this debate I would be reminded of that fact. The hon. member for Greenwood came close to it. The actual number of corporations which are not audited today by the Auditor General is small; I think there are four or five all told. The most outstanding of them, of course, are the C.N.R. and the Bank of Canada. The Auditor General entered into all the discussions on