

wording he is going to put on the votes broadened to convey more adequately what it is the votes are covering. You, on the other hand, may feel you would be just as content to look at the detail sheets and find the answers there rather than in the vote wording itself. But, that is the way I view it, and I feel I should make my position clear to the committee on this point. I would welcome a full discussion not only on the subject of the headings of the votes but also under the heading of the form and content of the estimates, including the proposition to consolidate the votes. It may be you would want to consider referring this very important matter and, I might say, very complex matter, to a sub-committee, as you did in 1961.

Mr. STARR: I would like to ask a question at this point. In view of your remarks near the end of your presentation I came to the conclusion that you, Mr. Henderson, did not have any strong objection to consolidating the number of votes but rather you thought if that was the case, then a full and complete explanation should be given as to what that vote represented.

Mr. HENDERSON: From the examples on the galley sheets Mr. Steele attached to the memorandum before the committee we certainly feel that in many cases the wording should be changed. I have examples here but they are too numerous to cite. I will put them together, if it is the committee's wish, at a later opportunity, or will lay them before a sub-committee to show why. Personally, I would rather push full steam ahead to get program budgeting and then let the vote structure emerge from that, which I suspect is what they had in mind when they issued their September 18 bulletin.

Mr. STARR: In view of that I wonder if Mr. Steele could give us the former votes and their description and compare them with what he proposes to do, so we could see what deletions have been made and how it is being described in the new format as compared with the old.

Mr. STEELE: Yes, we could do this. I think we have just one copy of this draft. Until we knew the wishes of the committee we did not want to prepare a larger number of copies of it. However, it is available and if it should be studied by the full committee or at the sub-committee level I would be pleased to make copies available.

The CHAIRMAN: We have the galley proofs of the suggested consolidation and, of course, we can produce the existing form.

Mr. STARR: Yes, in order that we may make a comparison.

Mr. STEELE: May I add one or two things at this point. I do not disagree with what Mr. Henderson has said about this; I quite agree with his observation, that the main point is the possible loss of parliamentary control. I would cite three or four things which led up to the conclusion we should make a recommendation on this.

Had there been no Glassco commission and none of the upsurge of interest in sort of reforming the whole structure of the estimates we would say without any hesitation at all this would be the type of recommendation we would have brought forward long since as being a desirable one not only from the point of view of departments but also from the point of view of the house if it helps to facilitate discussion in committee of supply, which is an important consideration. Our impression was that we certainly would like to have the views of all the members on this because we would be barking up the wrong tree if it was not so, and if what we proposed actually did not lead to a sharper type of discussion in committee of supply we should not proceed along that line.

Secondly, it seems to us the major reforms which are envisaged by the studies we are doing are at least two, and perhaps three years, off. It is our conclusion, in looking at it, we would be very fortunate if we could bring anything forward for 1965-66 and, possibly, 1966-67, and a better year, it seems to me, knowing all the problems involved in getting the department ready for this