and I have no wish to take exception to it at the present time, but I really require some instruction from Your Honour. I asked the minister a simple question, whether he will assure the house that steps will be taken to see that certain employers comply with the law of the land. I cannot see why this question is not proper and why the minister cannot give that assurance to the house.

Mr. Speaker: To my mind the question in the way it was asked is not an urgent question. The hon. member is suggesting that certain action should be taken by the minister. I assume he would bear that in mind, but to my mind the question is not an urgent one.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW DEPARTMENTS

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-178, respecting the organization of the government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the right hon. gentleman would not mind, I should like to make the point, having in mind the provisions of the resolution, having in mind the provisions of the statute, and having in mind the provisions of the British North America Act, that there is some doubt as to whether all parts of this bill might be discussed because they are not included in toto in the resolution.

This is a point in respect of which the Minister of Justice indicated there was a legal opinion from the law officers of the crown stating that this is possible. I do not wish to raise the point and deal with it extensively at this time, but so far as I personally am concerned I feel that if we do not raise the point at this time we may be losing our right to take the proper position at a later stage. I should like to make this point now and reserve the right to suggest that parts of the bill may not properly be before us because of the form of the resolution.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I may say I have been assured by our legal advisers that the resolution which has been accepted by the house makes it possible for the house to discuss every section and all items of the bill before it. The reason certain parts of the bill were not included in the resolution is that inclusion of all parts was not necessary because certain changes were made which did not involve financial matters of any kind. Therefore it was not necessary to include them in the resolution, although it would have been quite possible to have done so. For that reason the exclusion of these items from the resolution dealing with Bill C-178 does not in any way prejudice the right of members of this House of Commons to discuss on second reading and subsequently all sections of the bill which is before us.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister say, when he mentions law officers, whether they are the law officers of the Department of Justice; because the opinion I received, which was not from the law officers, was the very reverse.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, the view we received from the law officers was that the resolution in the form which was adopted would not in any way prejudice discussion of all items in the bill. The parts of the bill which were omitted were omitted for the reason that they did not involve any financial consideration and therefore were not required to be mentioned specifically in the resolution.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister assure the house that the advice he received was from the law officers of the Department of Justice or those who are responsible for the formation of the legislation?

Mr. Pearson: I will have to check on that. I was informed that it was the law officers, I believe in the Department of Justice and the Privy Council, but I should like to confirm this information.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the question in respect of the point of order which intrigues me is that I cannot see why you would not have to mention each department in order to discuss this legislation. In this resolution the Prime Minister is asking that the Department of Forestry and ARDA be made legal. Does there not have to be another resolution, or another statute at least, naming this department?

Mr. Pearson: I have been informed that this is not necessary and that the resolution does adequately cover all the items in the bill which is before us.