

*Finance*

the customer his right to expect that the product he buys will not maim or disfigure because of a defect in construction or design.

At the very least, consumers must be warned of the precautions they must take for their safety after buying a product which is potentially hazardous if misused or left within reach of children. The government can, as parliament can and must, ensure that these rights for the consumer are protected. This is clearly an obligation we cannot escape. I hope that this motion will pass and that the bill will go to the committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, where it will be considered as expeditiously as possible.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

**FINANCE****PROPOSED AMENDMENTS RESPECTING INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND EXCHANGE FUND ACCOUNT—REPORT STAGE**

**Hon. H. A. Olson (for the Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-138, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act and the Currency, Mint and Exchange Fund Act, as reported (with amendment) from the Standing Committee on Trade, Finance and Economic Affairs on Wednesday February 12, 1969, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order purely for the purpose of clarification. I think it would be helpful if Your Honour would give the house your interpretation. Your Honour will note that the report included two minor amendments which were accepted by the committee. Under normal circumstances, it would have been deemed that the amendments to the clause would open a debate. This would be deemed to be the purpose of the amendment, and if there was to be an amendment at the report stage there could be a debate on the clauses. While it is true no formal notice has been given by any individual members or a

member on behalf of the government in respect of these amendments as they were made in the committee, is it deemed that, having been made in the committee, they are brought in forthwith without debate and the motion is put and, if the motion is adopted, the bill stands as amended by the house?

If this is the case we could then proceed immediately to third reading. As Your Honour knows, if there are amendments at the report stage, there is a debate and the report is finally adopted and, there having been an amendment and a debate, we cannot proceed to third reading until the next sitting of the house. I should like to have this point clearly established. When a bill is reported by a committee with amendment, does this preclude the third reading of the bill on the same day without the leave of the house?

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for raising this point which has perhaps been left unanswered and uncertain because of circumstances which have occurred when we reached this stage of the proceedings on other occasions.

My understanding of standing order 75 (14) is that if the report from the committee does not include an amendment, at the report stage there can be third reading without debate on the same day. The standing order reads:

(14) When a bill has been reported from a standing or special committee and no amendment has been proposed thereto at the report stage, and in the case of a bill reported from a committee of the whole, with or without amendment, a motion, "That the bill be now read a third time and passed", may be made in the same sitting.

The hon. member has referred to an amendment which was not proposed at the report stage, but was proposed and adopted at the committee stage. It is only when there is an amendment adopted at the report stage that there cannot be two stages on the same day. When an amendment has been made by the committee and there is no further amendment, then under the standing order there can be a debate on third reading the same day.

I am not sure this is completely clear but I hope the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), who is I believe in agreement with my interpretation of the standing order, is satisfied with the way I have attempted to interpret the situation for the guidance of hon. members.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Perhaps I may say a few words, Mr. Speaker. In