

they are unaware. We must ask ourselves, who is serving what? Is government supposed to serve the people, or are the people supposed to serve government? Unless governments are a little more considerate, the elected officials in this House of Commons will continue to have a lot of problems.

There is a principle involved here that I hope will receive greater consideration from the government than it has up to the present time. There is a great danger in centralized control and power. Society today has only so much freedom. The more legislation and regulation imposed upon the general public, the less freedom the individual will have. The hon. member for Calgary North has spent a lifetime in the courts of Canada. He is to be commended for recognizing that the freedoms of the Canadian people are being eroded. It is the responsibility of each and every one of us to give more cognizance to the obligation of protecting the rights and freedoms of Canadians which are being eroded by regulations and legislation put forward by this government. A great many comments were made during second reading of this bill and in committee. We are, perhaps, getting to the point of being a little repetitious. However, if there is to be any justice in Canada, the Minister of Justice must recognize that the rights of the Canadian people should be foremost in the minds of those in cabinet.

I hope the minister will give greater consideration to this amendment. He should, at least, stand it for a while and consider whether it can be incorporated into the bill. The people I represent do not want any more freedoms eroded.

Mr. J. R. Holmes (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my support of the motion of my colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). It is an issue to which I have addressed myself many times in the past. It is a very fundamental principle. I refer to the problem of regulations which in many instances are the operative part of legislation that is not seen by this House of Commons or the standing committees before the bill is passed.

● (1640)

I might say that perhaps the major ground for complaint among my constituents with regard to this measure is the difficulty of assessing its impact in the absence of regulations. This is not a new complaint; I have discussed it on other occasions. I recall specifically the debate on the animal contagious diseases act. When that legislation was before the House and discussion centred on a whole new clause related to transportation, it was impossible for either the House or the committee to arrive at a reasonable assessment of its implications simply because the regulations had not then been promulgated.

Members who read the statements made on that occasion, both here and in the other chamber, will have noted that earnest requests were made by those concerned with the legislation and with the future of the industry to have the regulations brought forward so that a more informed judgment could be reached with regard to the proposed legislation. I remember, too, that while we were dealing with the environmental contaminants legislation a number of hon. members

Adjournment Motion

drew attention to the desirability of having the regulations before us so that we might arrive at an accurate assessment of the impact of the measure.

I have noticed very often that legislation brought forward encompasses regulations which have been passed by order in council and were never debated in the House, yet those very regulations have formed part of bills presented to us for approval. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of discussing the subject in greater detail at this time, but I wish to object to the manner in which this measure has been introduced and to point out, once again, that constituents in my area are dissatisfied with the restriction which has been placed on the full understanding of the effect of these provisions by virtue of the absence of regulations which will cause them to be operative.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): The question is on motion No. 7 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and motion No. 28 also in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): In my opinion the nays have it. Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11), the recorded division stands deferred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Transport; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Brisco)—Communications; the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs.