

*Government Organization*

about closer relationships between government departments than has been experienced in the past.

I hope the minister's philosophy in this new department will be not only business oriented, and I use that term loosely knowing that hon. members will know what I mean, but oriented to the needs of every part of our nation. Without this type of expertise in all social sciences this country and this new department will be the losers. I say to the minister that the clients he has to please are every man, woman and child of this country, and especially those of low or fixed income who are unable to fend for themselves in this highly technical world.

Naturally, officials of the various departments, as well as employees of departments, would like to set their own guidelines. If the minister is sincere in establishing guidelines for the new department that will really do the job we think ought to be done, we will support him, as will all those in this country who benefit.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Chairman, I think we have had a most interesting and valuable discussion on this very important bill and I think that it reflects, by and large, agreement with the proposals on which this bill is based. I do not know how hon. members would like me to deal with the various matters which have been raised. As I understood the discussion, a thread seemed to run through the minds of hon. members, and perhaps I could deal with specific topics that have been raised. The two matters which seem to have been raised most often by hon. members were the fact that in the new department there would be two deputy ministers and that the functions of the Receiver General were to be transferred to this department. Hon. members wanted to know the rationale behind that. I would like to deal with these two matters first, before touching on other specific matters raised by individual hon. members.

In so far as the two deputy ministers are concerned, Mr. Chairman, this does not mean an increase in the actual personnel of the department. It is simply a redesignation, if I can call it that, of the former Comptroller of the Treasury. Hon. members will note from early clauses of the bill dealing with this department that one of the responsibilities I have from the outset is to designate clearly and unmistakably what the duties of the two deputy ministers will be. This I intend to do. It is clearly evident, I think, that there will

not be what may be described as a crossover of responsibilities. The Deputy Minister of Supply will be the gentleman who already has that post and performed his duties admirably for many years. The Deputy Minister of Services will be the former Comptroller of the Treasury. So, there will not be the confusion that some hon. members understandably might anticipate, and I apologize for not making that clear in my opening statement. I am satisfied that this is the appropriate arrangement. It is not, of course, unique in the public service of this government or of many other governments. At the federal level there are quite a few departments with two deputy ministers.

On the question of the function of the Receiver General and the appropriateness of having this function as part of the responsibilities of the Minister of Supply and Services, I think there are real advantages to be gained in identifying with a single minister the closely related functions of the receipt, custody, disbursement and accounting of public funds. I want to emphasize that this is essentially the Receiver General's function, which is essentially a service function. There is no suggestion in the bill, nor is there any intention in the over-all plan, that the Receiver General shall have any responsibility in terms of what I might describe as policy decisions with regard to financial matters. His is the purely technical function of the retention or control, in custodial terms, of public funds. On the other side, there is the disbursement of all public funds. We are satisfied with this; a great deal of thought and work went into this matter, and we think that the present relationship in this field is an appropriate one.

There is a straight line through, as I said before, connecting the receipt of moneys, the custody of those moneys, the ultimate paying out of those moneys and the preparation of accounts relating to those public funds. I would be pleased to go on at greater length on this matter but it is not necessary. I will only say that identifying all the functions I have mentioned, which are closely related, with a single minister, responsibility and accountability are properly identified. The function can be most efficiently and economically handled on an integrated basis and there will be considerable convenience to departments, agencies of government, contractors and suppliers, as well as members of the general public, if a single office is identified as the control point for receipts, payments and inquiries related to either. As I