

*Government Organization*

That is why we nourish the hope, Mr. Chairman, that bilingualism will be a living, effective and accepted reality, not only for the minister, but also for government officials.

As for the new Department of Supply and Services setting an example for the others, so that the federal government can be really bilingual, the true image of Canada, since all of us here seem to want a bilingual Canada, it is up to us and the various departments.

[English]

**Mr. Thomson:** I want to put a question to the last speaker, if I may, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I should like to apologize for not being able to ask it in French; I hope to correct this before too long. My question is with regard to bilingualism in this or any other department. I did not quite understand whether the hon. member for Lotbinière wished this to happen automatically at the top level. It might not be possible to get bilingual people immediately who could do all the types of work necessary. What was the intention of the hon. member in this regard?

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the hon. member for his question. It gives me the opportunity to show how important it is to establish bilingualism at every level of the government machine and within the departments.

I believe that if bilingualism is possible, we must establish it at every level of the government structure. To give but one example, having examined the questions on the order paper and the annual reports of the various undertakings of the Canadian government, I have come to the conclusion that bilingualism is not getting a fair treatment. In fact, the answers the government gave me regarding the Bank of Canada, the Industrial Development Bank, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Eldorado Mining, COTC, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Polymer Ltd. indicate that 14.7 per cent only of the board directors are French-speaking against 85.3 per cent English-speaking.

You have only to compare those figures to the respective ratios of French-speaking or English-speaking Canadians to see that the federal administration does not reflect the true image of Canada. This is why I tell myself that if the government must reflect the true image of Canada it must do it at all levels. Does this answer the question of the hon. member?

[English]

**Mr. Crouse:** Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Minister of Defence Production as he outlined the setting up of the new department which will be called the Department of Supply and Services. It is heartening to note the manner in which the minister has taken on his new duties and, in true maritime fashion, is endeavouring to get his department shipshape. We look for great things from the minister—I am not sure whether I should call him the Minister of Defence Production or the Minister of Supply and Services—and I hope he will not let us down.

The prime intent in the drafting of all legislation, is to bring greater efficiency to government services. The same is true in the case of this legislation, and according to the information which has been supplied to the Public Accounts committee by the Auditor General, it is high time that some attempt was made to procure and to purchase requirements in a more efficient manner.

In clause 46 (3) at page 17 of the bill it is stated:

The minister shall provide, on the request of a department, any or all of the following services, namely:

- (a) management consulting services;
- (b) data processing services;
- (c) accounting services;
- (d) auditing services;
- (e) financial services; and
- (f) such other services of any kind as are within the duties, powers and functions of the Minister under this Part.

Like my colleague, the hon. member for Wellington, I cannot help but wonder about the power which will be vested in the minister of this new department. I personally believe that the office of the Receiver General, for example, should have been retained under the Minister of Finance, not that I have any doubts about the ability of the present Minister of Defence Production but because it seems to me that the duties of the Receiver General go well together with finance, somewhat like fish and chips. I believe that greater government efficiency could be achieved if these two departments were kept together.

The same rule of thumb applies to the auditing services which will now come under the Department of Supply and Services. Quite frankly, when the department came under the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury, a heavy responsibility was put on the Auditor General. But I believe that the change proposed in this legislation will lay even