

Private Members' Business

Second, we could regulate disclosure of prices at each distribution stage. As I was saying, in the United States—Mr. Speaker, the United States is not a socialist country. However, it may be a little more realistic than we are as far as prices are concerned. And I think that consumers, especially in Quebec where we have had legislation since 1980 which obliges distributors to have individual price tags on their products—I think the same approach could be applied to automobiles.

Finally, to my Liberal colleague who made disparaging remarks and claimed that all we want is to spend money and not really help the consumers, I would say that is not so. The bill introduced by my colleague is reasonable. We are in urgent need of this kind of legislation, because Canadians and Quebecers have had it with paying ridiculous prices for goods they can buy for less down south, in the United States. Also, this bill could be good for our business people, especially those close to the Canada-United States border, since they would be given a level playing field if we can just force suppliers to charge reasonable prices to their Canadian customers.

I support my colleague, and I think, as I said earlier, that this idea makes a lot of sense.

[*English*]

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in accordance with Standing Order 44(1) which says:

No member, unless otherwise provided by Standing or Special Order, may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his or her speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, and the Member is not to introduce any new matter, but then no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

It is quite clear that the hon. Liberal member did not understand that this debate was on the issue of cross-border shopping, the price differentials between Canada and the United States which impel it, the effect on consumers and the effect on business in this country.

It is unfortunate that he failed to do so. However, it is obvious that his comments, which were within the context of that speech irresponsible, could only be understood if he did not understand what I had said.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you would obviously be aware that the member who just spoke on an alleged point of order in reference to rule number 44, which does not even apply in this particular case, was trying to find a way to get in the second speech. I hope that you would recognize that because other members would like to speak and make an important contribution to this debate and I happen to be one of them.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): No other speaker having risen, the hon. member for Windsor—St-Clair availed himself of one of our rules, Standing Order 44, and no one objected. So, the Speaker showed some flexibility in recognizing the hon. member for Windsor—St-Clair.

[*English*]

There being no further members rising for debate, the time provided for the consideration of private members' business— Oh, I apologize, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I indicated when I rose on a point of order that I wanted to speak next.

First of all, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Dartmouth who effectively made such an important contribution, as he usually does, to this debate tonight. As the consumer critic for the Liberal opposition the member for Dartmouth is very concerned about prices in Canada, as we all should be. However, I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little bit concerned about a Royal commission at this time.

I say this because we are having a debate right now in this country as to whether or not we have the money necessary to give a very justified wage increase to our civil servants. We are having some difficulty in finding the funds to do that. We are having a hard time finding the money to participate in social programs and other useful measures. At the same time, I see this request for a Royal commission, and examine its mandate:

—to examine allegations of excessively high prices of various consumer goods and services in Canada as compared to other jurisdictions—