

Hazardous Substances

stage. I will suggest that, instead of having a period of only two years during which time such orders in council can be presented to this house, we should have a period of perhaps eight years. This should meet the objections to the original bill of those who put in section 8(3). The bill should certainly not be amended by parliament every two years, but should remain in force for a substantially longer interval, namely eight years. Perhaps eight years is too short a period of time, and it should be longer but eight years is my suggestion.

If this bill is passed in its present form it would introduce an element of uncertainty and risk into the law. This is always unfortunate. If the legislation is examined, it will be seen that section 9 allows for a board of review, which is flexible and allows sufficient or adequate appeal from decisions of the Governor in Council. If we carry on with section 8(3) as it now is we would be introducing a guarantee which in my opinion is quite unnecessary and indeed damaging to the object of the bill. With those remarks, I will resume my seat. While I support the bill, I sincerely hope the committee will take note of my remarks. If it does not and the bill comes back to the house in its present form, I will propose an amendment along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order in respect of the remarks of the previous speaker who has just indicated that he will move an amendment in respect of the bill. While it was distinctly suggested by the house leader of the Conservative party that members of the government do not move amendments to bills, I wonder whether Your Honour would like to rule on the priority of the hon. member indicating that he would propose an amendment during the committee stage.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, this does not involve a point of order but rather the grave danger in which the hon. member has placed his political career by daring to threaten the distinguished ornaments of the treasury benches who, from time to time when allowed, come into the house to discuss matters with which we are concerned. I will deal with those later.

I am very glad that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) has pointed this out because I think he has certainly opened the door to a very careful examination of what has taken place. Generally,

[Mr. Anderson.]

however, I accept the remarks made by the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski) who, in a brilliant and eloquent speech, placed his position and that of this party on the record in respect of the bill as it is presently constituted. There are, however, two collateral lines which I want to pursue. During the course of the debate I was wondering who would bell the cat for the government. I have now found that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) will, from now on, be the official cat-beller.

• (8:10 p.m.)

This opens a consideration of clause 8 and the amendment introduced in the other place. I hoped that the minister, rather than seeking some way to circumvent the very sound and statesmanlike decision which came out of the other place, would have accepted it. It must have been a chastening but enlightening experience for him to go into the other place and there be met with the wise and solemn decisions made by men who have served their country for years, the majority of them members of his party.

I have had an opportunity to read the reports of the other place. I have read the report of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, which committee examined the bill. I think eminently sound reasons were given for the amendments which have been introduced.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, I would be delighted to have questions.

Mr. Basford: I hope the hon. member is not implying in his remarks that we cannot expect wise and solemn decisions in this house, too.

Mr. Baldwin: I expect wise and solemn decisions from this side of the house, but in the light of experience during this session I am somewhat doubtful of the decisions which come from the government side. The government, through the medium of the minister and his officials and after what I presume was long and careful consideration, has carefully enumerated specific products which in part I are the subject of outright prohibition within the terms of the bill and in part II are the subject of conditional prohibition.

This is the basis on which I put it. If what the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich said is correct, and that is what the minister and his officials had in mind when they first