

*Government Organization*

in the debate on second reading and I shall not repeat any of the arguments which have been made. However, there is one point that concerns me, and I am glad to have within hearing not only the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Benson), who I gather is more or less responsible for the legislation, but also the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Favreau) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cardin). If I may invite their attention to the problem perhaps it may be solved quickly.

As matters now stand, if a person wants to look at the basic law regarding any department of government all he has to do is consult the index to the statutes and he will find there the Department of Justice Act, the Department of Labour Act, the Department of Agriculture Act, the Department of National Health and Welfare Act, and so on.

In the case of the present bill, for reasons which the Prime Minister gave and which carry some weight, several departments are having their basic structure comprised within one bill. It seems to me this will make things a bit confusing in future. I wonder whether the revision of the statutes now in process could cover this point? In other words, what I am asking is in two parts. First, would it be automatic that the commission revising the statutes would take this bill, if we get it through in time, and break it into its component parts so that the general picture I have outlined would still obtain?

Second, if that is not automatic, would there be any impropriety if the minister to whom this commission reports were to make the suggestion to the commission that this be done? I really do not think it is improper because in my own experience I once found an error in the revised statutes and wrote to a minister about it. It was suggested that I pass this information on to the commission.

This matter may be dealt with by a minister rising now in this debate or perhaps it could be dealt with later. I know it is only a small point. Indeed, it is only a technical point, but I suggest it is an important one since the whole purpose of this bill is to make things a bit more efficient. For heaven's sake let us not go in the other direction and find that some of our departmental statutes, which were easily found in the index, have been lost somewhere in an omnibus piece of legislation. I am glad to have the attention of three or four ministers with respect to this point and I would be quite happy to receive an answer from any one of them.

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, we would certainly be glad to pass along the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If what he suggests can possibly be done we shall certainly see that it is done.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my intervention will be brief. I put on the order paper on May 16 question No. 1,499 with regard to the proposal of the new department of manpower to establish manpower offices across the country. It is this proposal that prompted the question. I think the minister is well aware of the point I have raised. I know that it could just as simply be raised at the committee stage in discussion on the relevant clause, but I want to raise formally the matter inherent in the question I have put.

My question referred to the existence of a national organization of some years standing in 19 communities across the country known as Manpower Services Limited. If the department of manpower opens its manpower offices there will obviously be a great deal of confusion generated as a result of the similarity of names. Whether this was done *per incuriam* I do not know. I do feel there ought to be some form of negotiation or perhaps change with respect to this name because I do not believe that anybody in government, whether the department is big, medium or small, can afford to trample on the rights of the individual.

This matter affects the fundamental rights of individuals who have had some interest and will continue to have an interest in the name "Manpower Services Limited". To have the government come along and say they are going to open manpower offices for related purposes will cause a great deal of confusion. After all, the services of the department of manpower and the functions of Manpower Services Limited are related to the employment field.

There are a number of other things with regard to this bill that I could discuss relating to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and to other functions. Hon. members generally have canvassed this bill on second reading. May I also point out that, with the greatest of respect, I have found some little difficulty with regard to Mr. Speaker's ruling yesterday concerning the department of forestry and rural development. If it was not necessary for that department to appear in the resolution why was it necessary for the department of Indian affairs and northern development to