

it is more fitting to die on week days than it is on the week-ends in his riding. However, I do feel that the deputy minister in giving these extemporaneous remarks has introduced some rather far-reaching inferences when he suggests that the use of a service fee is being used for penalty purposes. I suggest that this goes beyond "Bill" Benidickson's riding and affects a large sector of the economy. This is the supplanting of legislation by administrative order, and that is defying the purpose of parliament. Probably I would modify that if I were making a prepared statement on it myself. But to supplant the intention of a service fee and utilize it by administrative decision for purposes other than those intended by parliament, surely is to supplant the intention of parliament. I also want to say in a very soft voice that I think more government employees could be an example. May I say with all respect that I do not think the deputy minister this morning has made a very good case for not keeping a seven day a week operation. If we are to be servants of the public and not parliamentarians only, I think that "Bill" Benidickson has made a very full case. But beyond that it has connotations for my area—for instance, in the maritime area. If we are going to have departmental administrative orders supplanting legislation, then I think we are going into a field which I think we should explore more fully. It gets out of the realm of cadavers in the Kenora-Rainy River area.

Mr. SIM: I am particularly sensitive to any charge of bureaucracy stepping between parliament and the people, and nothing would be further from my way of thinking. Perhaps it is just that my remarks were, as the hon. member indicated, extemporaneous and that, with no advance notice that the question was coming up, my remarks were not as full as they might have been. But to set the mind of the hon. gentleman at rest, as to whether somebody is contemplating something departmentally that parliament did not contemplate, the authority for all of this will be found in the Customs Act. It is laid down by parliament and provides for the regulation of the service. There is an order in council which does provide under this authority for those charges. Perhaps my use of the word "penal" was unfortunate. What I wanted to indicate by that was that we want to discourage people from doing business at all hours, if we can; I think that is not an unreasonable point of view.

Mr. MORRIS: It is not an unreasonable matter at all to ask people normally to do business in the normal times. But my point is that surely if there are circumstances which prohibit the Canadian taxpayer, or impede him from conducting his normal business during hours set by your administrative authority then surely we will have to have the administration conform to the public, rather than have the public conform to administrative order.

Mr. SIM: As is generally known, the port of Halifax is one of the great ports of the world. I am sure the hon. gentleman will agree there is a great deal of traffic coming through that port. In thirty years I cannot recall any complaint from Halifax about the services given by our people in that area. So whatever might be said on the principle that is being discussed now in a practical way, I do not think this is a vital issue. I checked with the officials here and they cannot recall any complaints at all from that area. This indicates to me that the people in the maritime provinces do business within business hours.

Mr. MORRIS: May I say that the witness has missed the point entirely, as I understand it. I am not talking here of my riding for one minute; I am talking about the application of an order for a service fee. Mr. Sim did say this administrative order was being used to penalize people.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I should point out that Mr. Sim suggested the word "penalty" was not the appropriate word to use in the circumstances.