

since Glassco made this particular recommendation and I think it should have been adopted before now.

The Department of Defence Production has always been a misnomer, at least since the war. It was given that name in wartime but immediately following the war I think we should have changed the name. It has always been the department that has bought supplies for the government and provided services. However, I am very happy to hear it will now be called the Department of Supply and Services. I might say that I am sure it will be in the hands of a good minister and we look forward to good results under his direction.

This minister spoke of area warehouses, but I should like to point out one danger that may exist with warehouses scattered across the country. Although in theory this proposal may be all right I think the department will have to be very careful to see that these warehouses are not overstocked, with surplus supplies here and there, hither and yon. Any public corporation will tell you that warehousing is a very expensive operation, and it is quite conceivable that the savings the department is trying to make could quite easily be eaten away by poor management, overstocking and surplus supplies.

With regard to printing services, I was pleased to hear the minister say that there will be a Queen's Printer for Canada. However, clause 48, on page 18 of the bill, reads in this way:

The minister may, by order, appoint an officer of the Department of Supply and Services to be the Queen's Printer for Canada—

The word is "may". We on this side of the house would feel far better if the clause read: "The minister shall". We would then know for sure that there is going to be a Queen's Printer for Canada. Some observations have been made in the house that the name of this position is going to disappear, so we would prefer the word "shall" to the word "may".

I now come to that part of the bill that I find hard to understand. Glassco made many recommendations and suggestions, but he did not suggest that certain finances and the Receiver General of Canada should be within the jurisdiction of the Department of Supply and Services. For the life of me I cannot understand why matters of finance such as those we have been discussing today come within the Department of Supply and Services. To me it is like the chairman of the board of a corporation going to the treasurer and saying, "I am sorry, but we are doing away

Government Organization

with your job; we are putting the purchasing agent in charge of finances." I cast no reflection on the minister's ability but, for the life of me, I cannot figure out who dreamed up the idea of making the Department of Supply and Services responsible for finance. It will be ridiculous for Canadians to have to write to the Receiver General of Canada in care of the Department of Supply and Services. All citizens expect the Receiver General of Canada to be either the Minister of Finance or the Treasury Board myself. I think this function should have been left with the Department of Finance or Treasury Board.

● (3:30 p.m.)

I understand that the Office of Comptroller of the Treasury is being abolished, as recommended by the Glassco commission. This work is now to be undertaken in various departments of government, each of which will conduct its own pre-audit. Deputy ministers will be responsible for that. They will be fully responsible for approving all payments that Treasury Board will have to make. I understand that 5,400 people work in the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury. What is to happen to them if that department is abolished? Where will they be moved and what will be the physical arrangements to take care of them? These are some questions we should like to have answered.

The idea that all departments will have to pay for the services they use is excellent. In so many words the minister said: "We have decided to charge departments for services we render, whether in data processing, consultation or any other field." In that way the maximum use will be made of existing facilities and we shall have a minimum of waste and inefficiency.

Until I arrived in the house I did not know I was to speak on this bill. May I say to the minister that I think the over-all recommendations contained in the bill are good but, as I said, for the life of me I cannot understand why the Department of Supply and Services is to carry out the functions of the Receiver General of Canada. The Mint is also to be transferred to this department. It really ought to be under the Department of Finance. What is happening to the Department of Finance? What will be its functions? Will it be shot to pieces, as seems to be the case? At one time it was next in importance to the Department of Justice but now it is being riddled with holes and its importance is being diminished.