

Government Organization

there is not to be a division made in the responsibilities now assigned to it, I hope arrangements will at least be made to appoint an associate minister to undertake specific responsibilities in the department just as the Associate Minister of National Defence does in the Department of National Defence.

We all realize that air transport in Canada, both passengers and freight, is growing rapidly. Members from all parties have, I believe, expressed a desire that there should be some division of responsibility to take account of this increase since it is becoming impossible for one minister to be familiar with every aspect of the department as it is now organized. I realize that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner) has been working very closely for some time with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) but it seems to me that when we are dealing with a bill intended to carry out government reorganization this is one department where provision should have been made officially at least for an associate minister if not for a clearcut division.

One other difficulty arises in connection with this measure. Schedule A includes a list of the various acts responsibility for which is assigned to the new departments. I suggest there should also be a complete list of acts indicating the departments to which they are assigned. I suppose that by a long process of deduction one could determine which of the acts are left within the purview of departments not superseded but it would be much more convenient to have such a list.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Finally, I simply say again that we do not regard a reorganization of the administrative responsibilities of the government as a substitute for policy. We still need leadership. We still need action by the government to bring in legislation on the basis of well-considered plans to meet the requirements of the future. We hope that in the days ahead there will be amendments to this legislation which will deal with the Department of Transport and, furthermore, which will deal also with some of the matters I have raised respecting consumers and their problems which have manifested themselves in very recent days.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Peace River wish to refer to the point of order he raised earlier today?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Having raised it before, I thought that as a matter of courtesy the debate should proceed to the point that one member of each party would have had the opportunity to speak, but I also thought it would be improper for me not to pursue the point of order I raised earlier. Your Honour may wish to take it under advisement and give your decision at some other time or Your Honour may wish to deal with the matter now.

Quite honestly I feel there is a serious defect in the bill before us and I should like very briefly to put before you the detail of the defect. In my view it is not lawful for us, under the provisions of section 54 of the British North America Act, to adopt this bill which deals with the appropriation of part of the public revenue, because it has not been adequately preceded by the form of resolution which it should have had as a foundation so that this bill would be properly in the custody of this house for discussion. The point raised at the time of consideration of the resolution was that the resolution, which purported to permit the house to deal among other things with the establishment of a department of forestry and rural development and the establishment of a minister of that department, failed to make provision for this and therefore the bill, in my submission, is tainted with illegality and we cannot consider it.

I do not think I need quote the precedents; they are contained in citation 243 and following of Bourinot. I should like to refer Your Honour to Bill C-178 which purports to establish several new cabinet positions and in doing so abolishes in several instances the old positions through repeal of the pertinent sections of other legislation. With regard to the Department of Forestry I should like to point out that clause 26 of Bill C-178 sets out in some detail a number of purported amendments to the Forestry Act. In part there is created a new ministry, a new department and a new minister, the minister of forestry and rural development. At the same time and by the same means there are clauses which repeal the existing provisions of the Forestry Act pursuant to which the minister is established. My simple proposition to Your Honour is that once you have, by the repeal of those sections which created the minister, caused the office to be abolished it is essential to create a new minister and a new department. In doing so, in order to provide for the salaries and payment of costs in respect of