

*Government Organization*

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Speaker, on this point of order may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he can assure us that the department or departments embodied in this legislation which were not mentioned in the resolution do not entail any additional expenditure?

**Mr. Pearson:** Yes, and there are other matters in the bill which were not mentioned in the resolution for the same reason; that is, they do not entail any expenditure of public money by reason of the changes which are recommended in the bill.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, having raised this matter, it was not my intention to ask for a ruling at this time. I simply wished to make certain that my right to discuss this particular aspect of it would be reserved, and that during the course of the discussion on second reading I could raise the point and be entitled to state why I think there may be some doubt as to the position of the government. However, I was not asking Your Honour to make a ruling at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** This was my understanding of the point raised by the hon. member for Peace River. I am very grateful that the hon. member is not asking for a ruling at this time.

**Mr. Starr:** Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, in order to substantiate the point of order which the hon. member for Peace River has in mind, I think we should hear his reasons at this time. If you make a ruling without hearing the arguments it may raise a doubt.

**Mr. Speaker:** My understanding is that the hon. member may wish to raise the point of order at a later date, and when he does the matter will be considered; but he is not submitting an argument at this time. I suggest we should allow the right hon. the Prime Minister to continue.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will not be out of order in repeating that although I have been informed by the law officers of the Department of Justice and the Privy Council that it was not necessary, I can understand the doubt which has been raised about the resolution seeming to exclude certain matters which are in the bill. These matters were not included, but I wish to state that there is no restriction on members in respect of discussion of all matters in the bill when we come to a detailed discussion of these items.

[Mr. Pearson.]

• (3:20 p.m.)

In the discussion of the resolution certain points were raised with which perhaps I should deal. There was the question of whether we should not have proceeded with a number of bills rather than one composite bill, each bill dealing with the particular department with which it was concerned. It could have been done that way but, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) ventured to suggest, it might take a good deal longer if we had a debate on five or six resolutions, second reading on five or six separate bills and consideration of five or six bills at the committee stage. Be that as it may, the same kind of debate covering the same ground, and I think in less time, is possible when we consider a bill of this kind covering all the departments concerned.

In so far as the point raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) is concerned, which related to amendments to this legislation that may be required, I think it is just as simple and convenient, and perhaps even more so, to make amendments to a composite bill of this kind than to make amendments to four or five separate bills. Be that as it may, it will be possible under legislation dealt with in this way to make the amendments which may be required in the future either by legislation or, as may be the case more often in the future, by action under existing legislation which does not require new legislative measures.

There were certain references made in the previous discussion to the purpose of this bill, at which time I think the purposes were not accurately described in certain respects, particularly as to why we brought in this far reaching change in the executive structure of government. This was simply done for the purpose, as we have said, of making the government more effective and more adaptable to changing circumstances. I think this legislation, if parliament accepts it, will have that effect. It has been suggested that this legislation, if it is accepted by parliament, will add to the number of members of the cabinet and that this might be undesirable because the cabinet is already, in the minds of some people, too large. So far as this particular bill is concerned and the action which is to be taken under it, it will not have that effect and will not mean any enlargement of the membership of the cabinet at the present time.