

Economic and Social Development

having responded with a truly critical analysis that is both positive and negative. This makes very clear the fact that on occasion there can be genuine debate in this House.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in my view what we need in Canada today is to do some thinking about where we are going, and about the kind of society we want. I am not concerned about our parliamentary institutions. I am concerned as to whether we really know what goals we want to achieve. I think we should do some hard thinking here in parliament. I think the people of the country should be encouraged to do their thinking and to add their input to ours. For these reasons I am glad this motion is before us and I am happy to indicate our support.

Mr. Frank Maine (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), I would like to congratulate the initiator of this motion because it is a very worth-while motion. As a scientist I am concerned about the problems of the future. I have been fighting a battle against those problems since I arrived here in 1974.

It has been mentioned that scientists caused all the problems of the past. They may have caused some of the problems, but they discovered some of the solutions of the past as well. They will also do so in the future. These solutions to problems should be planned as much as possible. To do this, you have to have debate from as wide a base as possible. I am in complete agreement with the context of what the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche) is trying to accomplish. The question, therefore, is just the method by which it can be done.

The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona made reference to Motion No. 13 under the heading "Government Business" which tackles this problem by asking that a special joint committee be appointed to consider and report upon the document entitled "The Way Ahead". The only difference between the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and the motion presented by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is that, in his interpretation, his motion is more widespread and all-encompassing. This is where I take a different interpretation. In the economic and social reference contained in the motion by the Minister of Finance these other areas he has mentioned are encompassed. It may not be spelled out in detail, but you really cannot talk about scientific development without keeping a very close eye on both the social consequences and the economic parameters. The economic restraints we live with today are very real, and will be in the future.

I was very impressed by the last budget which the Minister of Finance tabled which indicated that several things were done in the scientific area. Every one of them was done with very close regard to the economic aspects of it. In all the measures that were brought down in the budget, we saw there was reference to how much money these entailed and how these compared to what happened in that past. In the words of the motion by the Minister of Finance, the narrow context of

[Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain).]

social and economic parameters really encompasses all the wider ones. Therefore I see no difference between—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hour for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1977**AMENDMENTS TO CRIMINAL CODE**

On the Order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act—The Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Further to agreement made earlier this day with regard to the point of order with reference to the gun control bill, Bill C-51, I recognize the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, I will not take too much of the time of the House. Before commencing my argument with respect to the matter, I wish to refer to some of the other efforts that have been made in the House with regard to this and similar legislation to achieve some kind of severance in subject matter. What I want to deal with initially is efforts that have been made in the past concerning similar legislation and attempts in the past to sever omnibus legislation into separate pieces of legislation. Those previous efforts failed.

I refer specifically to the efforts of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in this House, and I think Your Honour was in the chair at that time, when he attempted to apply Standing Order 46 to introduce an amendment to the bill to have it referred back to committee to consider the procedure under which it was initially introduced.

There have been other efforts. The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) made a similar attempt to have a bill directed to different committees to deal with different aspects. Again in that instance, it failed.

My initial submission is that on the precedents, which no doubt the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox) will raise in opposition to this motion, the relevant rule is Standing Order 47 which reads as follows: