

*Point of Order*

The fourth agency is the International Centre for Ocean Development. Again the minister in this particular instance is the Minister for External Relations, which is different from the previous one.

The fifth agency is the Law Reform Commission of Canada. I might add that under the International Centre for Ocean Development, when one reads that statute, the consequential effects are to the Financial Administration Act, particularly part 1 of schedule III, as well as the International Centre for Ocean Development, the act itself.

Under the Law Reform Commission of Canada there are a number of statutes, some of which I have already referred to, that would be duly affected as a result. The minister in this particular instance would be the Minister of Justice.

The final one is the Science Council of Canada. The minister responsible would be the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology. Again a number of statutes would be affected, namely schedule I of the Access to Information Act, schedule II of the Financial Administration Act, schedule III of the Municipal Grants Act, the schedule of the Privacy Act, part 2 of schedule I of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, and part 1 of schedule I of the Public Service Superannuation Act.

The bill amends or repeals statutes affecting six agencies. If properly drafted, the long title would indicate its purpose of terminating specific agencies by name. This would of course uncover the real purpose of the bill: in the guise of cutting costs and eliminating some redundant bodies, to eliminate a number of government agencies that in the course of effectively carrying out their responsibilities have become thorns in the government's side.

I refer to your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Lucien Lamoureux, who was reported at page 284 of the House *Debates* on January 26, 1971. We were talking about an omnibus bill, and this clearly is an omnibus bill affecting six different agencies. I quote:

However, where do we stop? 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 improvement 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.

As I alluded to at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Lamoureux said that the most appropriate time in which to raise a point of order of this nature was after first reading but certainly before second reading. I believe in that same judgment you would hear him say the following words:

—it is much easier for the government to go back to the legislative mill, to the judicial luminaries of the Department of Justice where the bills are prepared, for the consideration of Parliament. If I may say so, I think that even those very learned gentlemen should take into account the fact that this aspect of legislation is of interest to all hon. members, of interest I am sure to the government, and certainly of interest to the Chair, namely, that there must be a point where an omnibus bill becomes more than an omnibus bill and is not acceptable from a procedural standpoint.

Superficially the principle of the bill, as the government purports, is to reduce the cost of government. In reality, however, it raises the principle—and I want to underline this—of maintaining the Economic Council as an independent advisory body on economy planning, the Science Council on scientific planning, the Law Reform Commission on the administration of justice, the Employment and Immigration Council, the Peace and Security Institute, and the International Centre for Ocean Development within their own areas of specialization.

It raises the question of the role of government in developing independent points of view to assist in long-term policy development. These are principles, I suggest, which are far different from that of the economic operation of the Government of Canada. Furthermore, each agency differs in its scope from the next, which means that the considerations involved are certainly far different.

Thus, in effect Bill C-63 raises not one but at least in my view six different principles. The umbrella of cost cutting may well apply to a number of agencies involved, but there are at least six agencies that raise such independent issues of public policy that they ought to be considered in separate bills.