

*Point of Order*

legislative agenda. But this is what the hon. member said on that particular day:

The fact that the principle of the bill is established and concurred in at second reading very seriously proscribes the types of amendments which might further be put to the House. Hence, we have the double dilemma of the impossibility of having a second reading vote on a bill which contains so many disparate principles, as well as the very serious difficulty in which the Chair would be placed in trying to ascertain what types of amendments are acceptable or not during further stages of a bill's consideration.

I think the hon. member opposite when he made that intervention in March of 1982 was not thinking of what would happen on March 30, 1992 in terms of this particular bill.

In summary, and I hope others will make interventions, I would argue that Bill C-63 has six different agencies, substantive agencies, all of which provide information to the government through different ministers, whose role and mandate is to interface with the Government of Canada, to provide it with information and, at times, opposing information to the views that the government may be pursuing. I suggest that it would be very difficult under the auspices of relevancy to be able to carry on a substantive debate at second reading. I suggest that it would be very difficult, if not next to impossible, to implement or put forward amendments which would be acceptable to the Chair.

Finally, I think it is time, if I may be permitted to use some personal language here, that the Chair recognize what is going on here. The government is holding Parliament, not up to ransom, but certainly holding us in somewhat of a disrepute in the sense that it just thinks it can come in any old time, slap a bill before the House for first reading, whether it covers four, five or six different agencies, and expect those of us in the opposition to merely nod our heads and proceed as usual. I do not think that is fair and I do not think that is appropriate. I would say to the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, who has tried to carve out a reputation and, in some instances, he has been successful as a reformist within Parliament and as a procedural person, that it is not fair or appropriate for the government to proceed with Bill C-63.

I want to thank the Chair for giving me the opportunity to make this intervention. I hope the Chair will reflect upon what I have said and perhaps will give due consideration, as the Chair always does, to colleagues on the other side as well as my distinguished colleague from Kamloops who no doubt will be making a reasoned, thoughtful, persuasive argument as he normally does.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will listen to the hon. member for Kamloops on his persuasive argument.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say right from the outset that I think this is a most critical issue that my hon. colleague has raised this morning. For many of us it is a bit of *déjà vu* because, as my colleague has indicated, I remember back in 1982 when our friend from Calgary was in the opposition and led a very, very tough debate and discussion around this issue dealing with the National Energy Program. As a matter of fact, it was the infamous 16 days of bell ringing and so on. It was one one of those special debates on these special issues.

Here we are once again attempting to make the point with the Chair, which at that time was made in the end successfully, to suggest that Bill C-63 is a bill that is very difficult to deal with as we would normally deal with a bill today at second reading because, as my hon. friend has indicated, second reading is the time when we discuss the principle of the bill.

When I saw this, I asked myself what is the principle of this bill. Is it dealing with employment and immigration matters because when you abandon the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council of course that is a major policy shift on the government in terms of changing that. Or is it to deal with Science Council issues? Again, when you wind up the Science Council of Canada you are making a major policy decision in the science area. Is the principle of the bill dealing with international peace and security which of course it does deal with. Does it deal with a whole variety of economic issues that the Economic Council of Canada has dealt with over the years?

It is perplexing because, as a responsible member of Parliament, one wants to debate the bill at second reading. One wants to debate the principle of the bill. I cannot determine what the principle of this bill is because it deals with a whole pot-pourri of different areas.