

Control of Sale of Hazardous Products

House signed by twenty-five members thereof and made in accordance with the rules of that House within ten days of the day the order was laid before Parliament, praying that the order or any part thereof be revoked, shall be debated in that House at the first convenient opportunity.

The point I want to make is that the way in which the amendment is put interferes with the procedures of this House. I think we could effect the same purpose and allow the House to remain in possession of its own procedures if the bill were amended in the rather simple manner I have proposed. This is a simple procedure which would accomplish the same things that were sought to be done by the committee, but the House would still remain in possession of its own procedures.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question before he sits down? In view of what seems to be reasonable logic in what he has said, can he tell the House how it happened that in the Standing Committee this provision for 25 members putting down their signatures became part of the amendment?

Mr. Deachman: I am sorry, I do not know since I was not a member of that standing committee. However, the records of the standing committee will have the story in full.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask another question since we seem to have time. What is the position of the government in respect of this matter? Did the government support the amendment in committee and then change its mind or has there been some hanky-panky going on?

● (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deachman: I do not know whether or not there has been hanky-panky, but I put to the house a very simple amendment which would return to the House of Commons its procedures. I hope that hon. members would like to remain in possession of their own procedures rather than having them within the terms of the act. This is why I seek agreement for this amendment.

Mr. Basford: In answer to the questions that have been asked, I might indicate that the government supports both amendments, the one that was made in committee and the one which is before us now. It is an improvement on the one put forward by the committee.

[Mr. Deachman.]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Where does that leave the rest of us? It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) makes sense since it leaves the matter in the hands of the house rather than trying to write house procedures into a statute. But I think I deserve to be forgiven for wondering what has been going on.

The minister did not make things any easier to understand when he said that the government supports both propositions. The government cannot do that—it is either one or the other.

Mr. Fairweather: They have been doing it for years.

Mr. Basford: The history of the matter is that an amendment was put forward in the Senate committee which was unacceptable to me as the minister responsible for the bill. Then, an amendment was made in the committee of the house, which was acceptable to me, but it transpired that there should have been further consultations on the amendment that was made in the committee to avoid the problem of which the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra spoke, that is that there was not sufficient consultation on the committee's amendment regarding the matter of the house controlling its own business. Therefore, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra put forward an amendment which I regard as an improvement over the one proposed in the committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The minister has won me over by telling me that what we are doing here is an improvement on what was done in the other place.

Mr. Lundrigan: May I ask the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra a question, Mr. Speaker?

First of all, I should like to congratulate the minister on the way in which he has piloted previous legislation. I am really not too clear on the nature of the amendment before us. I am sure the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra would like to elaborate on it and give us some more details of the amendment which he has proposed. I believe that other hon. members may also have questions about it, as do I. Perhaps we could begin by asking him what he had in mind, because he spoke about the amendment in a great hurry and certain questions were left in my mind.