

to a reduction of costs, but if there was that positive obligation, I assume there would be a reduction of costs arising from it. Then it may be that the Committee in its report would wish to suggest that we include such a term.

(Translation)

**Mr. Goyer:** Can we say then that the Minister feels able to act freely without any restraint towards Parliament to force these Crown corporations, to have policies which hold consequence in their relationship among each other, among themselves?

(English)

**Miss LaMarsh:** They are each set up by separate legislation and I suppose that there would have to be some sort of over-all act. Perhaps the Secretary of State's portion of the Government Organization Act might be used for this, to say that there was such a responsibility on me, but I wish members of the Committee would realize that at the moment there are 14 agencies in the Secretary of State's Department and I often feel like one of those men playing that shell game with the three shells; you get a shell popped over there and you think it is all right and it comes up over there. Fourteen is bad enough. So, in effect, if I had to substitute my own judgment in many of these things for that of the heads of the agencies, it would be very nearly an insuperable position. I do not think anyone would want to come and be the manager of any of these 14 agencies if he could manage only part of the time and the rest of the time the minister decided.

**Mr. Mather:** Having in mind the large number of these agencies for which the Minister reports—you say 13 or 14 . . .

**Miss LaMarsh:** Fourteen.

**Mr. Mather:** Fourteen—and also having in mind the immense significance of one of them, the broadcasting facility, would it not be worth while considering whether in future perhaps we should have a division whereby we had a minister of communications who would report for broadcasting, perhaps, and the National Film Board? Would this not simplify or ease the immense load of work which the Minister must have been under?

**Miss LaMarsh:** I do not find it an immense load of work. I am not running them.

**Mr. Mather:** I notice that but . . .

**The Chairman:** We are straying a bit from the Bill under consideration, Mr. Mather. This is something that might be more properly examined when we get the Estimates of the Department, if we do.

**Miss LaMarsh:** There are a lot of things in the Transport Department, too, that would fit into such a portfolio.

**Mr. Mather:** I agree. I think there might be some time given later to considering whether we have the best set-up for reporting on these agencies.

**The Chairman:** I think many of us have given a lot of thought to that but under this Bill I am not sure that we will progress very far, section by section, if we debate the over-all responsibilities of the Secretary of State.

**Mr. Fairweather:** There is a point, Mr. Chairman, that I think I would like to follow up on, although I do not mean to flog this particularly. On the matter of national unity, it seems to me that there could be as many attitudes towards this phrase as there are people here or in fact, citizens; and it has been pointed out to me that if, as Mr. Prittie said, this slid into the area of national interest, for instance what is the national interest to the President of the United States vis-à-vis Viet Nam? I think the phrase is such a nebulous one and has such different meanings for all of us that it is a pity it is used here. I know what I think national unity means but I do not suppose that anybody else at this table would agree with my feelings. I do think there is the danger that it can be misconstrued in slipping over into the national interest. It is all very well with a sophisticated Minister and a Prime Minister who may have a particular point of view in this matter, but all sorts of things can happen.

**Miss LaMarsh:** Well, we did not discover that.

**Mr. Fairweather:** I think clause 2 is a good idea, but just wondered how essential. I know that the White Paper and our Committee recommended that this be said very clearly. I liked your reply to Mr. Sylvestre. It satisfied me but I still think that at this stage on this rather open-minded clause we might think of this and think of whether we cannot get the same concept but without the doubt that would flow from—I guess I am not making myself clear but . . .