

to be the subject of legislation. Some would necessitate more than one bill. In addition to this list, which can be found in *Hansard* of October 8 or 9, a number of further measures were mentioned. So at least 75 legislative proposals were, probably, to be dealt with by Parliament.

What has happened? I have compiled a list of the legislation which has been dealt with in the House from October 8, 1970 to April 7, 1971, when the Easter recess began. I have chosen these dates because an examination of the period they comprise will support beyond doubt my allegation of gross administrative ineptness on the part of the government. I have looked up the length of time taken on each bill. There were two measures which took considerable time. One is the bill before us today. I shall not go into that now; we have had our debates on that subject and the reasons have been clearly set forth. I see the Postmaster General nodding his head. He agrees with me, I think, that there are good reasons for the length of time our discussions have taken. Another measure upon which a great deal of time was spent was the public order emergency legislation. I will simply remind hon. members that the Minister of Justice, introducing the bill, launched an attack of considerable severity against the New Democratic Party. It was his right to do so, but he exercised it in such a way as to ensure there would likely be a long and bitter debate, as in fact was the case.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Excepting those two bills, what has been the situation? From October 8 to April 7, 16 bills were passed which took approximately one day or less. Six bills took approximately two days or less, two bills took between three and five days and then, of course, there were the other two bills I have dealt with, the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act and this particular bill. So this House did its job on the measures which it received.

What has happened to the rest of the bills? Some were introduced in the other place and some here, but by April 7 to my recollection there were at least 20 measures which it had been indicated by the government, through the lips of His Excellency, were essential to the proper social and economic progress of this country but which had not yet seen the light of day in this House. Some were important bills that have not yet been introduced. However, over 20 had not been introduced into this House at that time, including the established programs (interim arrangements) act, the pilotage legislation, a bill respecting the maritime code, a bill to amend the Combines Investigation Act, the resource administration legislation, a bill to amend section 51 of the British North America Act, the computer facilities ownership legislation, a bill to amend the Immigration Appeal Board Act, a bill to amend the Criminal Code (right to privacy), a bill respecting the security review board, a bill to amend the Citizenship Act, a bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, a bill to amend the National Parks Act, a bill respecting cigarette advertising, a bill amending the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act, a bill to amend the Representation Commission Act, and the ports legislation,

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

which may have been introduced in the other place, though I do not think so.

**An hon. Member:** What about Bill C-176, the marketing act?

**Mr. Baldwin:** But for the stupidity and obstinacy of members on the other side of the House, this bill has not got as far as it should. Because of confusion among the members of the cabinet and divisions of opinion, because of the proliferation of cabinet committees, and because of all these other things that can be characterized as nothing but gross administrative incompetency, none of these measures that I have mentioned had seen the light of day by April 7. Surely, any reasonable body of hon. gentlemen charged with the administration of this country should introduce on the first day of any session those measures which they say are necessary, in their opinion, for the well-being of this country. Each bill should be prepared and available in printed form. It is not as if many of these were new measures. I have heard the need for some of these bills kicked around the halls of this place for several years.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that when he takes advantage of this legislation to establish new ministries of state and to appoint new ministers of state he should look very carefully at the system he has created, one which as far as this House is concerned is a nightmare. I also think it is about time that the Prime Minister and his friends took a look at the cabinet structure and called in some parliamentary, government and efficiency experts to revise these procedures so as to produce a simple legislative form, and to have available on the first day of any session all bills they needed for the session. Then Parliament will have ample time to study the measures in question.

I think we can take parliamentary notice of the fact that owing to the house committee system there are problems in this House. I am not going into this subject any more; enough has been said and it will probably be brought forward again on other occasions, hopefully in the procedure committee. But as a result of the committee structure that is inflicted upon us and a lot of other difficulties that have been created, it is absolutely essential for the effective administration of this country and for the handling of the affairs of Parliament that bills be ready for presentation on the first day of every session and be introduced and given first reading at that time. This will give members of the opposition as well as members of the public, who after all are far more interested in them than anybody else, ample opportunity to examine and consider them and to promote public debate upon them.

If this is one, then after these bills are introduced in the House there will be adequate opportunity for reflection, for consideration to be given to them, thus enabling the kind of debate that should take place. I say this in all kindness. Although there are some members of the cabinet and in the government party who believe this, I know the trouble stems from the office of the Prime Minister