

*Energy*

**Mr. Pinard:** It is obvious the bill is not completely ready now. Perhaps it will be completed before five o'clock. If it is, I am sure the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council will come into the House and seek unanimous consent to introduce it. I cannot make any commitment on that because I do not know if the bill will be ready before five o'clock.

Also while I am on my feet, there is unanimous consent to proceed with the consideration of Bill C-214 and that the preceding item numbers be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Mr. Speaker, the understanding is that we will proceed with item No. 7 in the name of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and take the appropriate steps to move that to the next stage before proceeding with the consideration of Bill C-214. I think that is the understanding.

\* \* \*

**ENERGY**

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF DOCUMENT "THE  
MANAGEMENT OF CANADA'S NUCLEAR WASTES" AND  
EVIDENCE ADDUCED THEREON

**Hon. Bud Cullen (for Mr. Gillespie)** moved:

That the document entitled "The Management of Canada's Nuclear Wastes", tabled Tuesday, November 22, 1977 (Sessional Paper No. 303-4/96), together with the evidence adduced thereon in the Third Session of the Thirtieth Parliament, be referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions, and private bills.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS**

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is item No. 9 standing in the name of the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Siddon) stood by unanimous agreement?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is item No. 10 standing in the name of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) stood by unanimous agreement?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton).]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is item No. 13 standing in the name of the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) stood by unanimous agreement?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

**CANADA SUNSET ACT**

MEASURE TO SUBJECT ALL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND  
OPERATIONS TO REGULAR REVIEW

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East)** moved that Bill C-214, to establish a Sunset Law for Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a year ago this month I had an opportunity, during debate on a motion regarding the role and scope of government activity in society and the economy, to speak on the subject of sunset laws. At that time I read into the record a suggested draft bill on the sunset concept. The bill we are discussing today is primarily the same as that earlier draft. As a private member's bill, of course it is limited by the constraints which restrict all private members' bills. Nevertheless, I feel it provides a solid base to discuss a pragmatic and promising approach to the problem of increasingly overgrown and unresponsive government.

The proliferation of federal agencies, commissions, boards, offices and even ministries, which have sprouted forth in such numbers in recent years, must be brought under some kind of control and scrutiny. The problem with these agencies and programs, which perhaps were established originally for a specific and worth-while purpose, is that they seem to defy the laws of nature. They never die natural deaths; they seem to acquire a life of their own. Even if they were set up originally with a narrowly defined purpose, they tend to generate new functions and responsibilities almost by an unconscious reflex action. Over time, what was once a responsive and flexible agency can become a tangled labyrinth, snarled in its own complexity and buried beneath the weight of "proper" procedures.

I feel the sunset law approach is essential, but it is not the only instrument available to us. It is essential if we are to control some of the bureaucratic sprawl. Such legislation would provide for the periodic termination of government agencies and programs unless they are able to justify their continued existence. The sunset concept involves setting fixed dates for the automatic termination of government agencies and programs in order to force their full-scale review. If this review shows they have served the purpose for which they were created, then a positive legislative act, resolution or some other positive act would be required to extend the life of a particular agency or program. However, if one was deemed to be no longer relevant, useful or necessary, then it would be either modified or allowed to terminate.