

Mr. Deachman: The purpose of the amendment is very simple. It does not really relate to the bill as much as to the way in which procedures are to be handled in parliament. Provision is made in the bill for additions to the schedule of hazardous substances from time to time. If hon. members turn to the *Votes and Proceedings* of March 10, they will see at page 779 the way in which this was to be put into the act by an amendment proposed by the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. The committee proposed a series of procedures in parliament which would take away from parliament the right to handle its own affairs. These procedures would be set forth in the act. What I propose to do by the simple amendment is to effect the same purpose so far as the bill is concerned, while leaving the matter of how it is to be proceeded with in the House of Commons in the hands of parliament itself. To put it in exact words, the amendment to sub-clause (4) reads as follows:

If both Houses of Parliament resolve that an order or any part thereof should be revoked, that order or that part thereof is thereupon revoked.

It does not, for instance, tell them what procedures they should employ in order to do that. It is a simple technical amendment which concerns this house rather than the bill itself.

Mr. Lundrigan: I am taking the chance of running into some heavy weather with some experts in the house, especially members from out west such as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), but I did get the impression from the minister's remarks that he was not satisfied with the amendment. The only thing that worries me is the fact that the principle involved is more important than the amendment itself. Of course we have run into this problem in various other committees, such as in the committee on fisheries. About a month ago we attempted to make certain amendments in the committee which were later not accepted in the house.

I would like to believe that there is a possibility of proposing amendments in standing committees that can receive approval in the house. For example, I should like to ask the minister whether, if a standing committee of the house makes an amendment of which he does not approve, he can automatically prevent the amendment from coming to the house. Do the regulations of the house which we adopted recently allow such a situation?

Control of Sale of Hazardous Products

The matter which I bring to the attention of the house is related directly to the powers of standing committees and the possibility of the legislative process being thwarted if the minister is not in favour of an amendment proposed in the committee. I wonder whether, as was said recently by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), we have a dictatorship instead of a parliamentary system in that ministers of the cabinet can determine the exact nature of the legislation to be presented to the house, especially now that there is a majority government in control. This is a lengthy question which is not directly related to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, but I should like to hear the minister's reaction to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I might make an observation at this point. I do not want to interfere with the debate, but I feel that this line of questioning is out of order. I understand the hon. member's concern, and perhaps it may be in the best interest of the house for the minister to answer, but I want to add that caveat. I have misgivings as to this type of questioning on such an amendment.

Mr. Basford: The plain fact is that any committee that has a piece of legislation in front of it can amend it, and the bill comes to this house as amended by the committee. That is the case with Bill S-26 before us now which went into committee in one form and came out of it in an amended form. This amendment, which was placed on the order paper and moved by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, is an improvement over the amendment made in the committee. It does not nullify the amendment made in the committee.

Both amendments involve the same principle, namely, that orders made under the act be laid before parliament, and the new amendment deals only with procedure. I want to emphasize that if a standing committee has a bill before it, it can amend it. The bill then comes to the House of Commons as amended, and the minister cannot throw those amendments out.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I say, with your indulgence, that if you consider my previous interventions to have been questions, I should now like to ask for the floor to say that in the light of the explanations we have heard I