

people who wish to become citizens, or a sad effect on the relatives of prospective immigrants who want to bring their loved ones to join them.

I say that the Department of Manpower and Immigration is hiding behind a definition of parliament that parliament should not have passed when the Statutory Instruments Act was passed. None of us saw the evil at that time, however. The fact is that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Andras) and his department can hide behind a practice that is as undemocratic as anything that you or I could think of, Mr. Speaker. I mention this because I do not want to see the same thing happen with the powers that the government is asking us to give in Bill C-73.

There are five places within Bill C-73 where powers of regulation are given, and one of them I think is unacceptable. The procedure of the appeal tribunal is set forth in clause 26(5). It has the power to make rules and regulations governing its own procedure that any court or quasi-court must have, and I do not think that is something that need concern the government. There are other powers, however.

In clause 3(1), the governor in council can publish guidelines, and in clause 3(2) he can issue guidelines regarding prices and profit margins. I think that puts the governor in council, as the cabinet or minister bringing in these proposals, within a pretty large field of human endeavour and one which can affect almost everybody in Canada. I am curious about what is going to happen when clause 4(5) comes up for debate and what effect the government's agreement with the provinces will have on professional fees. Is it possible that a fee structure can be imposed upon professional people in certain provinces that would never be subject to scrutiny in this House, or in the statutory instruments committee or any other place? This clause provides for dealings between the provincial government and the federal government. Apparently there is no right of recourse to the professional group in provincial legislatures, and this is a very serious matter.

I continue the catalogue of possible powers with two other points, Mr. Speaker. According to clause 13(2), the Anti-Inflation Board may give notice of types of disclosure and the setting up of notices which presumably are directed to individuals or whole industries. This is also a matter of very serious moment. What sort of information would be required, for example? Would it be within the spirit of the act, or would it be possible to stretch the content to contain something not within the spirit of the act—although the act seems so broad that everything would be included in the spirit of what hon. gentlemen opposite propose doing.

I have said that the provisions of clause 26(5) appear quite normal to me. Undoubtedly, this matter would come before the statutory instruments committee as do other boards, tribunals and the like. They are generally of a pattern. I do not raise any cry of "star chamber" or the like, because I think by and large Canadian tribunals tend to govern themselves in a pretty civilized way. You will notice I said "tribunals", Mr. Speaker, but nothing about government departments, boards, agencies or corporations given the power to pass regulations.

Finally, I come to clause 39. The three others I mentioned, Nos. 3, 4 and 13, were not broad enough. The

Anti-Inflation Act

governor in council is given the power, all over again, to make regulations in a pretty general way, not even being tied down to the powers suggested in the preceding clauses. I do not think the House of Commons or the other place would be doing their duty if they allowed the bill to go through without one of two things happening, so I put it up to the two ministers now present, the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) and the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé), to pass on to their colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). His absence this afternoon is understandable; I know he is meeting with his provincial counterparts, so I make no criticism about that. I say that the Minister of Finance must stand in his place, or somebody on the government side must, and before second reading is over indicate that the guidelines, the regulations, the directions—anything done under this act that is directed toward the people it governs—ought to contain a clear guarantee that this matter will go to the Standing Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments for consideration. That committee has some power, which it has never abused, and it could examine and bring to the limelight the things that bother us.

● (1730)

I hope that the Minister of Finance or some other minister on behalf of the government can make it very clear that there is going to be the utmost co-operation in parliament in seeing that all of these directives, guidelines, and what-not, go before the scrutiny committee of the two Houses of parliament for study. I put the government on notice that at report stage there will be an amendment moved, that notwithstanding the very restrictive definitions in the Statutory Instruments Act, all guidelines, documents, directives, and so on, under Bill C-73 be referred to that committee of the two Houses of parliament. I put it very simply: we want a guarantee or there will be a flaming debate in this House about what should be done to guarantee the rights of parliament for scrutiny.

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Bill C-73 I wish to place before the House some of my concerns as I see Canada's economic future developing. In the past few days we have seen the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who has always prided himself on being the best example of Canadian public life and being able to use the public media for his purposes, possibly having had that media turn against him to some degree.

Yesterday the Prime Minister took his road show to the fair city of Winnipeg. He presented to the people of that city his views on how the prices and incomes policy of the government will work. Apparently the Prime Minister had a prepared speech, but he scrapped that. While the speech might have been prepared, the program he was going to describe was not. Instead of giving his prepared speech, he spent a fair bit of time lecturing his listeners on the basic fundamentals of democracy and how democracy had to work. He, of course, was the expert on how the democratic system was going to work once he had Bill C-73 in place. To say the least, the speech was not accepted graciously. The press today is—

An hon. Member: Less than complimentary.