

[Translation]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on the bill before the House. As others have pointed out, this one contains proposals applying to about nine topics. Once again we are dealing with an omnibus bill not unlike one we had before. It is not quite the same because it is less erotic and less sadistic, but it is more political and patronizing.

In rising tonight and repeating just about all the others have said, I am wondering whether we will bring the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to reason and prevent introduction of still more omnibus bills.

This afternoon we heard the very interesting speech of the future parliamentary secretary of the future Department of Environment. At least, he introduced himself as such. His speech was very captivating precisely because it dealt with only one topic, namely our environment.

There is an example of the effect of a bill on a precise subject. I have listened to the hon. member with great interest because he gave precise arguments on a given subject. It would have been a different thing if he had had to deal with all the subjects under this bill.

Still, before referring this bill to the committee of the whole, we are asked to express our views on the general principle of the bill and to vote, if required.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how we could logically vote on such a bill because we agree with several clauses, particularly with Part I on the environment and others such as the one about the Post Office. On the other hand, we reject other parts that deal with, for instance, the increase in the number of parliamentary secretaries and the appointment of Ministers of State whom I call "ministers of unemployed parliamentarians" because they have no department to head. We also oppose other principles. We must absolutely try to make up our minds about the bill to be able to vote for or against it.

Given a bill such as this, the opposition parties should form a coalition and refuse to refer it to the committee. I cannot reasonably say that I am in favour of the bill now under consideration because it contains too many disparate provisions.

Even you, Mr. Speaker, I think that you have voiced your disagreement when you asked yourself how long will the government continue to introduce such bills as this one entitled: "An Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto."

If we consider the contents of the bill, we find a speech from the throne. Moreover, we note that all members speak as if they were discussing a speech from the throne. In fact, it is more a program than a bill and this is why I liked your statement, as recorded on page 2768 of *Hansard* which reads as follows:

However where do we stop?

You were then referring to the introduction of omnibus bills.

Where is the point of no return? The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and I believe the hon. member for Edmonton West, said that we might reach the point where we would have only one bill, a bill at the start of the session for the improve-

### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

ment of the quality of life in Canada which would include every single proposed piece of legislation for the session. That would be an omnibus bill with a capital "O" and a capital "B". But would it be acceptable legislation? There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am fully in agreement with you, and specially when you said:

Having said this, I would have to rule—if I must rule—that the government has followed the practice that has been accepted in the past, rightly or wrongly, but that we may have reached the point where we are going too far.

We say about this omnibus bill, as we said about the first omnibus bill, when we were mixing homosexuals with guns and bullets and abortion. Today it is the same confusion and we are asked—whether we like it or not—to accept it as a whole. Even if it is impossible to convince the Prime Minister, I wished to make these comments in order to rally other members of his party to our viewpoint. I will never believe that this group of 150 will be influenced by one man. When we tell them that it is nonsense—you do so yourself even—they still try to convince us that it is logical, and this has gone on for two days. There is no need to be a lawyer or a judge to realize it. I am quite willing to accept the wrapping, but the contents seem hardly digestible, Mr. Speaker, and it is the reason why I make these remarks before expressing my opinion on each clause of the bill.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The first part deals with pollution and the establishment of a Department of the Environment. I am very happy that such a department is being set up but my pleasure is mixed with fear. Indeed the functions and the powers of the Minister of the Environment include all the matters that fall within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The laws do not give to some other department, ministry, branch or agency of the government of Canada jurisdiction over fisheries, renewable resources including forest resources, migratory birds and other non-domestic flora and fauna, and water. As for water pollution, it originates in the lakes and streams that flow into the rivers. In this connection, the federal government will cross swords with the provinces, since it always refers us back to the provincial government. I cannot imagine how it can be, since we have been urging all governments to stop the large companies in our areas from pouring their waste into our rivers all year around.

In my region, there was a salmon river which has been polluted by paper mills in the last 30 years. Now, we can only catch third grade fish in it. Whatever warning we give the federal government, as I did when I was the mayor of my town, in order to try and call its attention to that, the answer is: This is the jurisdiction of the provincial government. I turned to the provincial government without ever obtaining the slightest improvement. The company responsible for pollution kept on making everything dirty with impunity, and, today, we are surprised. Governments had been advised of this. They were aware of it. It seems surprising today that everything should be polluted. Governments have known about this for 35 or 40 years and still, they tolerate this situation.