

Government Organization Act, 1970

[Translation]

Mr. Albert Bécharde (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind is not as cruel as my hon. friends of the opposition might think. If at six o'clock I am not finished with my remarks, it will not mean that I am necessarily opposed to Bill C-16 introduced by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). Indeed, as was said by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth), the Minister of Justice has repeatedly stated, I believe, that he was for the abolition of corporal punishment and that a bill to this effect would soon be introduced.

The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) did ask a while ago the hon. member for New Westminster when the minister intended to introduce this bill. May I inform him that if his party had not delayed to such an extent consideration of Bill C-181 last fall, we might have been in a position to pass this legislation in the very near future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The time allotted to the consideration of private members' Business has expired and I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[English]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1970**

PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION, MINISTRIES OF STATE, PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Drury (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-207, respecting the organization of the government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, before five o'clock I said that I wanted to deal with a few minor points before reaching the substantive part of my remarks in connection with Bill C-207. The second point I wish to make, and admittedly it is a detail, concerns some of the translation of the bill. If expert advice is correct, it would seem that if one were to adopt the English language version of the bill it would be quite simple to develop Fundy tidal power, whereas if one were to adopt the French language version that would be much more difficult. I am sure the government does not intend to develop Fundy tidal power and therefore it

[Mr. Hogarth.]

does not matter which language version of the bill one chooses to look at. But it is a point worth noting. Once again we have before us, so to speak, two bills. On the basis of expert advice it seems that the legislation as drafted in either of the two languages may be construed somewhat differently on this point.

I do not intend to cover the waterfront in my speech. For one thing, as a backbencher it would be presumptuous of me to cover the many proposals put forward in the bill. My colleagues will be joining me and will be making specific contributions. For example, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) will deal with the demise of the Department of Fisheries, that honoured and ancient department, under this legislation. His colleague and my colleague who represents an adjoining riding, the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) will deal with the pollution authority to be established by the bill. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales) will deal with costs. Before the debate is over other members of the Progressive Conservative Party will make contributions. My contribution will be to sketch things out in a general way on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and perhaps to concentrate more specifically on areas that have caused me and my colleagues the greatest concern.

Unquestionably, as was argued earlier today, there are a great many elements to this bill, some of them laudable and easily supported, some questionable and others that probably ought not to be supported at all. Hence arises our concern about the omnibus feature of the bill. It reminds me of the concoction depicted in Al Capp's cartoon series, "Li'l Abner," as kickapoo joy juice, which is made by melting together and mixing almost all ingredients under the sun, some of them tasteful and others not quite so tasteful. The prize part of the kickapoo joy juice legislation which we are considering concerns the department of the environment. I think that is the chief jewel the government can display in the showcase so far as this legislation is concerned.

May I say, first of all, that there is some advantage in having the battle against pollution directed by a single minister. The direction of this battle has up to now been spread among several ministers. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) has some part of it. His role will probably continue. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) is also involved in the battle, but he uses it as an excuse to thump his chest over the issue of sovereignty. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) is in it. His department contains the greatest number of experts in the fight against pollution. These experts are to be transferred to the new department of the environment.

I am sure that my colleague from South Shore, who will follow me in the debate, will deal with the demise of the Department of Fisheries in his usual capable manner. I was going to say "exhaustive manner" but I would not want anyone to misunderstand the use of the word "exhaustive" in connection with the speech of the hon. member for South Shore. The subject will be covered and no stone will be left unturned. I hope that describes