

Excise Tax

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but according to my understanding of the rules, he is allowed 20 minutes.

Mr. Lambert: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member actually moving on behalf of the official opposition?

Mr. Lambert: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Lambert: This subgroup of alcohol and tobacco are considered to be social sins, the devil's goods, in the minds of some people. Therefore, I suppose it is that much easier to make this House swallow this first bitter pill. However, that is not the way it will work. This House has to reject the principle out of hand, because the next step will be for manufactured goods generally, and all other goods and services which are subject to the federal excise tax, to be made subject to indexation. The special sales tax on airline tickets is a classic example. That is a sales tax. It comes under the excise tax and it will be subject to indexation under the CPI. Everything is going to be gathered up together in one big, fat snowball to go rolling down the hill, picking up everything in its way and finishing up at the bottom with everyone in a great smash. The thing is pernicious.

When I think that the government of Ontario, in its recent budget, has adopted that principle in certain of its statutes, all I can say is shame. It is a bad principle and should be repudiated in the same way I am asking this House to repudiate the attempt of the government on this occasion to bring that principle in.

It is not brought in by the back door. It is being done openly. The Minister of Finance said that he wishes to benefit from additional revenue. He needs the additional revenue. However, he does not have the gumption to come before us with his budget and face up to Parliament. It is Parliament that decides whether the government shall get the money. We allow indexation and then the government does not have to meet. It goes on generally. Soon the government—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would like to call the hon. member's attention to a Standing Order which is quite clear. Section 75, subsection 9 states:

—no member shall speak more than once or longer than twenty minutes during proceedings on any amendment at that stage, except that the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, a Minister of the Crown or other member sponsoring a bill and the member proposing an amendment, may speak for not more than forty minutes.

An hon. Member: That is what this is, an amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding that the amendment stands in the name of hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). The hon. member is not proposing the amendment at this stage, and the 20-minute rule would apply to him.

Mr. Lambert: With the greatest of respect, I moved the amendment on behalf of the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), and there are many other amendments in his name. He is precluded from speaking by his absence on a task force. I am taking all of these amendments and I am proposing all the amendments. I submit that the Speaker has to recognize it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the rules of the House there is a procedure by which hon. members lay down amendments at the report stage. The procedure has been observed up to this point. My understanding is that the rule would allow the hon. member 20 minutes at this stage. If this is going to be a 40-minute procedure for every one of the amendments in the name of the hon. member for Mississauga South, I would respectfully wish to defer my decision on the matter for the moment and I will confer with the Table and Madam Speaker. But certainly my first presumption, on the reading of the rule, is that it is abundantly clear. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Lambert: I will not argue with the Chair but I will simply say that it has been my experience and that of other senior members of this House, when dealing with this particular feature, that it has always been indicated that it would apply whether it was the hon. member proposing or he who was proposing in lieu. In other words, since, in effect, I am proposing the amendment, I have the 40 minutes, and I will continue on that basis.

Mr. Collette: A point of order. Mr. Speaker, you have correctly pointed out the rule of the House to the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I was in the House a little while ago when Madam Speaker was in the chair, and quite distinctly the motion was moved in the name of the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). I do not think we are going to put up any great fuss, but we would certainly support the Chair and the Chair's interpretation of the rules.

● (1610)

I must set the record straight. Motion No. 1 was read. Motion No. 3 was then read after it was drawn to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that they were being grouped together. In both cases the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) moved the motion. He was in the House and in both cases the motions were seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Lambert: Again, it was our argument that the motion would not have to be seconded. The motion was moved by me on behalf of the hon. member for Mississauga South.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will check *Hansard* later. Meanwhile the hon. member will be allowed to proceed. The Chair has, however, indicated the interpretation is subject to a review of *Hansard*.

Mr. Lambert: And also authorities.