

Routine Proceedings

It is therefore important for the government to have the good sense to limit the cuts in its next budget and to ensure that we have adequate inspection for the protection of consumers.

• (1310)

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member for Saskatoon—Humboldt has the floor and may reply to the comment.

Mr. Hovdebo: The member for Carleton—Gloucester has expanded on one of the concerns that the committee had at that particular time. If he has an opportunity to debate a little later on, I would appreciate hearing his views.

Things have changed considerably. Fifteen years ago, you could bring a bird into Canada by taking it into an agricultural station and having them look at it and they would accept it into Canada if it looked healthy. We have come a long way from that time and it has been very necessary in order to protect the health of our animals and birds.

But the idea of food inspection at the border is something which has not been dealt with particularly well in the free trade agreement and is being used against us when we ship food to the States. We are much more lenient with food coming into Canada, although we had the case of cyanide in the grapes which caused a considerable to-do in the past. Those kinds of things are in the regulations, so there is a real necessity to review and look at the control of food coming into the country and of live animals and plants coming into the country as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Murphy: Point of order. Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, the hon. member for Churchill.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the member for Kamloops be now heard.

Mr. Kempling: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Murphy: Yes, it is. It's the only way you can do it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The right hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I think there is some question as to whether that point of order is receivable. I would ask the Chair to take it under advisement, to render a decision later this day or next week, and to allow the business of the House to proceed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will give the floor to the member for Kamloops.

The procedure in a matter such as this is the following, and if I am not right I am sure members will correct me. Two members stood at the same time, the member for Peace River and the member for Kamloops, and the Chair did recognize on debate the member for Peace River. The matter that the Chair has to take into consideration is whether the member for Peace River started his speech, even with one or two words. Once that is done, and if that is done before the member for Churchill seeks the floor on a point of order, then the member for Peace River has the floor.

In this particular case, the Chair heard the member for Churchill yell "point of order" shortly before the member for Peace River said "Mr. Speaker". That is the interpretation of the Chair. That is why I believe the motion is in order.

In defence, of course, of the member for Peace River, I must say it was probably a split second. The member for Peace River.

Mr. Cooper: I would claim that this is discrimination because of my height. My problem is that my voice, even though I know I began speaking before the hon. member for Churchill, did not project up to the ceiling and back down to the Chair in the same time. So, Mr. Speaker, this is discrimination. I was speaking. I should have the floor.

Mr. Murphy: On the same point, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I am not that much taller, but since the microphones are below our heads, I would assume that he was actually closer to the microphone and that you had more chance to hear him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.