

departments have become so split up that the average man having a problem and wishing to bring it to the attention of his government is faced with the additional problem of knowing where to write, and to whom he may direct his questions.

The Minister of Labour, who is sitting opposite me, is one of the most efficient ministers in the government, and I am certain that he could handle the portfolio of manpower as well as of labour. The two fit nicely together. When you are talking of one you are talking of the other, and the policies of one affect the policies of the other. If we are going to get the maximum benefit in this country it is necessary to have both those portfolios combined under the supervision of one good man.

The hon. member for Carleton mentioned immigration and citizenship. I shall not dwell on them, but I do wish to mention the Department of Agriculture which at present is split three ways. The marketing of wheat, which is one of the principal functions in agriculture, is just about a full time job for one man, working in co-operation with the Wheat Board and with all other agencies of government concerned with the marketing and the finding of markets for wheat, in order to keep a balance between supply and demand and give the farmers the maximum return for their product. But no one man, be it the present minister or anyone else, can handle the heavy work of the Department of Finance and also the marketing of wheat. The two do not fit together. Marketing of wheat, a part of agriculture, is tailored to fit one particular individual who is responsible for the agricultural portfolio.

Dealing with the other splits in the Department of Agriculture, I notice the Minister of Forestry is also in the chamber. He has responsibility for ARDA, and for feed grain for eastern farmers. I submit that a minister of agriculture could be assigned those functions. I can understand why he was given them, in order to give an eastern connotation or flavour to actions which might be taken. I submit that the responsibilities for ARDA, feed grain and so on, rest primarily and most efficiently under a minister of agriculture, as does also the marketing of wheat.

The present Minister of Agriculture is responsible for certain scientific branches. He also controls the pricing of certain products such as butter and eggs, but at the same time he is concerned with production. I would like to see any corporation that could operate efficiently if it had production in one centre

and the marketing away off somewhere else. These have to be co-ordinated under one individual.

The production of wheat and other agricultural products, as well as the marketing of them, should be the responsibility of one man, who would also look after pricing,—instead of being scattered all over the map as they are at present, one in finance, one in forestry and one in agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture was split up in order to accommodate the former minister of agriculture. There is no doubt about that. Now it is split up to help accommodate the demand for someone who can look after Quebec. We all want Quebec looked after, just as we want all other provinces looked after. One department should be sufficient for agriculture, and one should be sufficient for manpower and labour.

If I were to repeat what other hon. members have said I could show where we can do away with no less than six ministers, which would bring the number of departments down to about 20.

If we had only 20 ministers, then to make the house operate efficiently I suggest that a committee of members be set up behind each minister, and stipulate that each minister attend all the meetings of his respective committee. At the present time we have a committee structure under which we cannot get quorums. I ask why? It ties into this whole set-up of governmental organization, and when you talk about one part you are also talking about the other. It is like a number of balls in a bowl: When you move one ball every other ball shifts to a new position. The same thing is true when you delve into the question of the proper organization to make parliament click.

Parliament is not clicking now, and a lot of people are saying that we should do this or that in order to make it more effective. I suggest that if parliament were organized in terms of a number of committees, one behind each department, and made it obligatory for the respective minister to attend all committee meetings, the system would work. A committee chairman could ask a particular minister, well in advance, what dates he could attend.

We all know ministers are busy but they are not such big shots that they cannot attend committees when members of the house are present. When I want to get some point across on the estimates of a particular minister, I can do it in committee if the minister is