

to cut wood for \$10, \$15 or \$20, he would see that the individual so authorized did not go further than permitted; and then he could send a remittance of that amount to Ottawa. That procedure involved an entry in his books, a letter to a stenographer, the sending of the remittance to Ottawa, a letter of acknowledgment, and entries in the books of the department in Ottawa by the Parks Branch, and then a remittance to the Receiver General.

In many of these parks there were hundreds of these items and each one had to go through this process.

There was nothing on earth to prevent a change in that system, so that the parks superintendent and his accountant could be bonded and he could have the right to deposit these amounts in the nearest bank available to him, then to check out against those accounts such petty expenses as the cost of hiring a few men to shovel snow after a snow storm.

The amount of paper work involved in the present procedure is really enormous. I suspect that what the Glassco Commission had in mind was some method of dealing with this. It involves putting more responsibility on the man in the field. Within these processes, he can be checked. First of all, he can be bonded for the handling of funds, then the Auditor General could make periodic checks on him without notice to see that he was living within the spirit of the regulations. In that way we could cut down a great deal of the clerical work.

I have used those illustrations, but the same thing would apply in the case of family allowances and to some extent in the case of old age pensions. It certainly would apply in some aspects of agriculture where under the P.F.R.A. for instance they let out grazing leases. The amount of paper work required is tremendous and one could scarcely get enough files in the Government to handle it. There is no doubt in my mind, as a result of my own experience in the Government, that tremendous economies could be effected in that respect.

The tradition has grown up, fostered naturally by people associated with the departments, that you cannot trust the man outside to look after these things and in the public interests everything must be sent back to Ottawa in the way of revenue and sent to the Receiver General. It does not matter much which way it finds its way to the Receiver General, but this could all be done within the framework of protecting the expenditures in the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Glassco would agree with you. I think that is the basis.

Senator CRERAR: I think that is what the Glassco Commission had mainly in mind.

Senator GROSART: Mr. Chairman, you asked for suggestions which might clarify it. I suggest that we put in at the bottom of page 6, the following:

It should, perhaps, be made clear that this suggested extension of spending authority within departments refers only to expenditures already authorized by Parliament.

Senator CRERAR: I remember when I was in Mines and Resources all revenues from the Northwest Territories for trapping licences and fishing licences ran to several hundred thousand dollars a year.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not really spending authority, it is extension of authority.

Senator GROSART: I would suggest that it is an extension of spending authority, because that is exactly what they are asking for—they want authority to spend within the department, and not to have to go to the Treasury and be obliged to say, "This is the suggested expenditure within the framework of the vote."