

*Government Orders*

either the House or the Senate, 20 members can get up and ask that it be debated. Normally, most of the regulations would go right through but if a bad or a weak regulation was presented, then 20 members could get together and have a debate in the House or in a committee of the House. Within five sitting days after the filing of the motion without debate or amendment the House would have to put the question.

The regulation could not be delayed forever. You could not use it as a measure of delay. We are hopefully going to use it as a measure of public scrutiny.

My question to the parliamentary secretary is, if it was good enough for the gun control bill, is it good enough for the environment bill? I am waiting for the answer.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, regulations have always been a controversial issue. The most benign of bills can quickly become obnoxious and offensive by the establishment of regulations which do not please the population. I am sure that every member of this House has supported a bill as it passed through the House only to find that the regulations had made the bill impossible to support or, if they had known what the regulations were going to be when the bill went through the House, would never have supported the bill in the first place.

The process being suggested by the member for the Battlefords—Meadow Lake was unique until the bill on gun control came before this House. It is no longer a unique process, but it is still unique as far as the people of Canada are concerned. It is the first time that there has been the possibility of them being given input into regulations as they were being drafted or immediately after being drafted.

In the past, the regulations have often been laid before the parliamentary committee for scrutiny and a certain amount of debate. In some cases, I suppose, there was a certain amount of change, but there has not been in the past any machinery which has allowed the House of Commons to take a look at those regulations and make sure that they are acceptable by the—

**An hon. member:** And sometimes the regulations would not be legal.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** That is right. As my colleague has suggested, sometimes regulations have been found to be illegal. Those kinds of things can be brought before the House, debated and then voted on by this House.

This makes this House rather than the bureaucracy responsible for the regulations. I think the gun control legislation is probably a good example of the kind of information that needs to be fed into a committee or into the bureaucracy to establish the kind of regulations which are acceptable to the population of the country.

Should this be passed or put into this act, it would mean that no one can put into regulations the kind of policy which negates the act that was passed in the first place. That is the case if it is taken up by the courts which have often found that the regulations are illegal. No one knows at the moment what is going to be in the regulations, although we are often told when the bill goes through committee what is intended to be in the regulations, but we are often told things which either do not turn up at all, are changed considerably before they come before the committee or are put into effect as far as Canada is concerned.

Should members of Parliament in this House not be responsible for the effects of their actions? We pass legislation daily, or quite often. That legislation then becomes law and the bureaucrats or somebody establish a series of regulations. Maybe the method that is suggested here is a little cumbersome, but it is the best we have. We hope it is going to work well in the gun control legislation. Consequently, if it is accepted by this Parliament now, we hope it will work well in this particular act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Can I put the question on Motion No. 31?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will call it six o'clock.