

*Point of Order*

Speaker, all fill different needs. There is nothing in common between the work of the Employment and Immigration Advisory Council and that of the Economic Council or the Science Council.

But now the government is putting forward a bill to simply eliminate these institutions, which is a rather broad and indefinite principle. This initiative leaves a lot to be desired because, if we refer to the parliamentary rules of procedure, we can see that on second reading only the principle of the bill can be debated. In this case, the principle defined by speakers from the government side to date remains rather blurred and unclear.

I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to Speaker Lamoureux's rulings, on page 107.

[*English*]

I go to Mr. Lamoureux's statement in regard to the principle of a bill at second reading and I read "the issue at second reading can by particular provisions in a bill be debated and if a decision is no, the principle of a bill can be debated but not particular provisions".

The reasons given by the Speaker is that when a motion for second reading is before the House, the House may debate in a general way the principle of the bill but not the clauses in detail. They and the schedules should be debated at another stage.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be quite difficult to debate the principle of this bill which is strictly to terminate certain corporations and other bodies.

In debate will we be able to give our viewpoint on the Economic Council of Canada and try to make the case that the principle of abolishing, disbanding that council is wrong? Mr. Speaker, you will have to make up an imaginative debate to try and prevent some of us on this side of the House at least from doing that. Otherwise it will for nought.

The parliamentary secretary said that this is not an omnibus bill. I do not know what the heck an omnibus bill is if this is not an omnibus bill. It covers a whole series of things. It has an approach which is common to a series of uncommon and unrelated agencies. The only common thread to the whole bill is that they are abolishing them, they are closing them down, they are, in

their own words, terminating certain corporations. So the termination is the principle of the bill. The others, whether they are important or not, are not to be discussed.

• (1240)

When the parliamentary secretary for the government House leader spoke, he read from page 194 of *Beauchesne*, citation 634. He did not read the first phrase, he missed it. He read the last phrase. I want to put into the record all of the citation:

Speakers have expressed deep concern about the use of omnibus bills, and have suggested that there must be "a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint". (*Debates*, January 26, 1971, p. 2768.)

There is a point beyond which this House must not be taken for granted in debating bills at second reading. I was here when the Tories objected to the energy bill. I was here when they rang the bell for two weeks in protest. I was here when they contested, opposed and protested the decision of the government and of the Speaker to deal with the bill in 1982. I did not think the opposition was making a very convincing argument at the time. They opposed at that time something which today they are doing. They are not being very consistent.

I do not want to prolong the debate, but let me say that there are certain things in our rules and procedures that need to be looked at. Whether this is called an omnibus bill or not I do not think is relevant. This is a bill touching on a variety of agencies and institutions of Parliament. The only purpose of the bill flows from a budget announcement some months ago where the government announced that it would abandon or close or terminate the existence of these corporations, these bodies.

I take exception to that. I do not think this bill is appropriate in its present form. I do think that every one of those agencies, whether it is Economic Council of Canada, the Science Council, the Public Service Staff Relations Board, or the agency that collects facts and figures for the government so that it can negotiate decently with the other agencies, the Pay Research Bureau has merit. The Pay Research Bureau is something which, in my view, we need. How can I argue for the maintenance of the Pay Research Bureau—