

*Government Organization*

and that is divisive confusion, to which I referred before when I spoke on this subject. There will be confusion and division. It would have been far better had the Department of Justice, with the exception of the two branches I have mentioned, remained as it was.

With regard to the new duties of the President of the Privy Council, I have this to say, and I say it with the greatest respect to him, there being nothing personal in my remarks. Whether he declined the offer or a change was made at the time, he did not seem to fit into the portfolio of Minister of Justice. He either had a problem with his leader or it was an administrative problem, but whatever the problem was he became President of the Privy Council. Then in order perhaps to satisfy his ego a little he was given one of the minor responsibilities of the Department of Justice. If that is called reorganization of government, then it is not good enough for me, Mr. Speaker.

Then another branch of the department, I think the fourth branch, that which administers our patent law, is to be administered by the registrar general. I am glad to see that taken out of the department. If I can discuss this matter under reorganization of departments, the patent law of this country is a disgrace. Only recently a man in western Canada who had invented a new kind of plough which would crush rocks, roots and similar substances wanted to patent his invention so that it would not fall into the hands of the United States, and in order to do so first had to register it in the patent office in Great Britain and then reregister it in Canada to protect his invention in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a patent solicitor but I was advised by the experts in Toronto that it had to be done in that way in order to safeguard the patent. Therefore I suggest to the minister who is taking over responsibility for our patent law that some arrangement should be made, with the United States particularly, so that when patents are registered in Canada they are recognized both in that country and throughout the world. otherwise our office will just be a rubber stamp as far as patents are concerned. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Prime Minister for this reorganization, which has been neglected in the past probably because our ministers of justice have been busy with the administration of the law and their other duties.

When new portfolios are created you also create new departments, which means taking on additional employees. Two years ago—I have not made inquiries since—I asked the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to work out for me the amount of the budget which is devoted to the salaries of civil servants in this country—not that they are overpaid by any means in many of the categories—and I was told that \$1.57 billion goes for salaries.

There is a feeling across the nation today that the government are building up large bureaucracies. Whether this has been brought about by the new pension plan or by the reorganization of various departments, appointing new deputy ministers and taking on more staff, it means we have more bureaucrats, which will have to be paid for through more taxes. If efficiency is the result, then in light of our growing population we might say it is good organization. But if it really means that we are fitting the job to the man because the Prime Minister has not got the right man for the job, then this means additional cost to the taxpayers of this nation. I should like to repeat that two years ago—and the figure must be higher today—\$1.57 billion of our budget went toward civil servants' salaries. That is a lot of money spent on running the nation.

On top of this, Mr. Speaker, we must remember when talking of reorganization of government that there are ten provincial governments. Therefore we can see how much it is costing to govern this country. If Canada has one problem which is gnawing away at its ribs, it is the problem that as a nation we are over-governed. I regret to say it, but every time I hear speakers in the House of Commons trying to whittle away the powers of the central government which were laid down by the constitution in order to decentralize the nation, it seems to me that this means more bureaucracy, because we are really setting up ten distinct nations.

As the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Hamilton) said, the problems of the nation demand more than having the minister of resources running across the nation making speeches. He made a speech in Calgary, if I may quote this as an illustration, and was supposed to speak about resources. We feel we are sitting, Mr. Speaker, on great pools of oil out there, with large contracts being made with Japan and other nations. Yet this minister devotes two thirds of his speech to the B. and B. Commission. We all know about the B. and B. Commission.