

Statutory Instruments Act

ernment in furtherance of the policies contained in this bill.

This bill will be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for a thorough clause by clause scrutiny. I do not propose to take the time of the House this evening to discuss the details of the bill. I will confine my remarks to a few general statements, since I will make a more detailed statement on the bill at the report stage. All hon. members, whether they are members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs or not, will also be able to raise questions at that time.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Lawyers and non-lawyers.

Mr. MacGuigan: As the minister suggests, lawyers and non-lawyers. I wish to pay tribute to a number of members opposite for the very great contribution which they made to the presentation of the report by the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments—which is the basis of this present legislation. I wish to pay tribute to the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), who is in the House this evening. He and the hon. member for Greenwood were pillars of strength on the committee. They made very material contributions to the report which was presented.

I also wish to mention the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), who is not in the House this evening but who was a very active member of that committee. Also present for the debate this evening is the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Forest), the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Murphy) and the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson), all of whom were very active members of the committee. I thank them for their contributions. By not mentioning the names of all members of the committee I do not want to suggest that they did not make as full a contribution. Indeed, they did, but it would be tedious to go through the whole list. However, I want to thank all members of the committee.

At this time I want to say a special word of thanks to certain members of the government. In his presentation before the committee, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) urged us to present a bold report and to press the government to reveal areas which had hitherto not been considered to be matters of public knowledge. The leadership of the minister and the then President of the Privy Council were very instrumental in helping the committee to present its report and in getting the report before the House. I also thank the present House Leader for giving this matter a relatively high priority on the list of government bills.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacGuigan: I want to mention the two counsel who assisted the committee, Dr. Gilles Pépin, now of the University of Montreal, and Mr. John Morden of Toronto. They were of considerable assistance to the committee throughout the hearings and in the preparation of the final report.

[Mr. MacGuigan.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacGuigan: I make these comments to illustrate the contribution which a great many people made to the report and to this bill, as well as to other implementations which the government will be bringing forward. This is a genuine team effort. I thank members from both sides of the House. I take great satisfaction from the fact that the report is far-reaching and that in presenting this bill the government has maintained the thrust of the committee's recommendations. This matter is of sufficient importance to mention at this time so that the House will take formal notice of it. I reserve any further comments until I have the opportunity of participating in discussion at the committee stage. I will then have some words to say at the report stage.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) remind us of the exhortations of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that the committee bring forward a bold report. The committee may have acted in that regard. However, I wish the minister had been as persuasive with his colleagues so that we would have had a bill which measured up to the level of his exhortations.

● (9:30 p.m.)

This bill is a timid, half step. I hope to demonstrate where the government and Parliament should have gone with regard to this bill. I was not a member of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, but my hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and I have been especially concerned about this subject.

Those members of the House who served with me on the finance committee and, from time to time, on the justice committee will know that I have been a steady critic over the years of those sections of any legislation brought before the committee or this House giving broad, sweeping powers to the governor in council to make regulations. I have been particularly critical of the wording that is used. I can point to a rather regular consistency, bill after bill, every year over the past several years, where I have been very critical of this.

As a matter of fact, just a few weeks ago, on the bill dealing with sales finance companies, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) was prepared to accept a suggestion that we remove some highly offensive wording which would have precluded any questioning of regulations. In other words, the government itself would have been the judge of the quality and propriety of the regulations which it purported to pass under that law.

It seems to me that Bill C-182 has been drawn up—of course, it was drawn by the Department of Justice—for the benefit of the Department of Justice. It has a neat flavour in that the ultimate authority is, naturally, in regard to references—and they are almost legion—to the Deputy Minister of Justice. It is provided that these regulations shall all be passed, that there shall be certifi-