

Trade Marks Act

bers rarely raise a subject under this rule that is not important and worthy of consideration, and this is certainly no exception; it is a very important question—debate on a matter under Standing Order 26 is reserved for matters that present an emergency and an hon. member moves that the House do adjourn because of the emergency nature of the matter.

The matter raised by the hon. member is, by its very nature—supported by the context of the hon. member's remarks—some two years old. The trial which is to take place is a civil trial and is not scheduled for another month. Under these circumstances, it would be stretching the provisions of Standing Order 26 and its interpretation beyond the limits if I were to find that the motion came within the order. I therefore have no hesitation in not accepting the hon. member's proposal.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE AND TRADE MARKS ACTS

MEASURE TO REPEAL THE PROPRIETARY OR PATENT MEDICINE ACT AND AMEND TRADE MARKS ACT

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill S-9, to repeal the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and to amend the Trade Marks Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates to the question of where we send this bill after it is given second reading. Since it is a very simple bill and likely to occasion little debate, and since the committee to which it is referred is overloaded with work, I wonder if there might be an agreement to deal with the bill, after second reading, in committee of the whole.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as far as we on this side of the House are concerned, we would accept that suggestion.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, that is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the House, then, in respect of the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), if there is unanimous consent that the motion be amended at this time so that the reference would be to a committee of the whole rather than to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is so amended.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Laniel in the chair.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I was not listening carefully, but having spoken with the hon. member for Athabasca, who is in charge of this matter on behalf of our party, I find that while we agreed that the matter should be referred to committee of the whole rather than to the standing committee, we were under the impression that there would be at least limited debate on second reading. If, in fact, the order made was to the effect that second reading be eliminated, that was not the understanding of this party.

I felt I should bring this matter to Your Honours' attention of the House. It was not our understanding that this bill would be sent to committee of the whole without at least some debate on second reading. If that was the order, it was not our understanding or belief.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As the one who made the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I was not proposing that there be no debate on second reading. I thought there would be a short debate on second reading and little or no debate at committee of the whole stage. I suggest that the second reading stage having taken place so quickly, and this was no doubt an oversight, perhaps the situation could be corrected simply by allowing the so-called second reading speeches to be made now.

The Chairman: Order, please. I suggest there is an alternative; either to ask the Chairman to occupy the Speaker's chair and have a second reading debate, or to allow general debate on the first item of the bill within the confines of the committee of the whole. I am sure hon. members can express their views in the same way, unless they are looking forward to a type of proceeding of the House other than second reading stage.

● (1210)

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, under those circumstances, and to facilitate the proceedings, I think we agree that we should have what would be the equivalent of a second reading debate on the first item. However, I urge Your Honour, when paying attention to the quality and direction of the debate, to lean lightly on members so that to all intents and purposes we have the same situation as in a second reading debate, except that speeches would be limited to 20 minutes but the same member might be allowed two 20-minute periods instead of one 40-minute period.

The Chairman: The Chair does not have any difficulty in respect of the suggestion of the hon. member for Peace River. We will proceed to the consideration of clause 1.

On clause 1.

Mr. Lalonde: Mr. Chairman, I did not think the consideration of this bill would move so quickly, but I thank you for your interpretation of the rules in allowing us to have some debate, at least, at this stage that is similar to debate at second reading stage.

I should like to take a few minutes to put before the House the purpose of this legislation which is amending an act that has been part of Canadian legislation for quite a long time and which has had a consequential effect upon Canadians. The introduction of this bill to repeal the