

about compensation, would the minister advise the House when he will announce some type of catch insurance program for fishermen in the Atlantic region or for all Canadian fishermen?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): As the hon. member knows, a catch insurance plan is in prospect. However, we would like to see the unemployment insurance program in effect a few years before we make alternative proposals to the fishermen.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Clark (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates to the reply to a question tabled today over the signature of the Minister of Transport. I would have raised it earlier but I only received the answer during the question period. In my question I asked how many acres of land Canadian Pacific Railway owns now in consequence of original grants of land by the government, and also whether there were any present exemptions on any of that land. I received a reply which reads:

This information is not available because there is no requirement for CPR to report the status of their remaining land grants.

Clearly, that does not answer my question at all and it completely ignores the request for information about present exemptions. It indicates to me that the Minister of Transport is as uncommunicative in writing as he is in person.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Lundrigan: I intended to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare or the government House leader a question about the FISP bill, but I do not see either of them in the House so it will have to wait.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT (No. 2)

The House resumed, from Wednesday, June 20, consideration in committee of Bill C-192, to amend the Income Tax Act (No. 2)—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. McCleave in the chair.

● (1530)

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of the whole on Bill C-192, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (No. 2). When the committee rose on Wednesday, June 20, clause 1 of the bill was under discussion. Shall clause 1 carry?

On clause 1—*Deduction from corporate tax: manufacturing and processing profits.*

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Chairman, as a result of informal discussions with the Minister of

Income Tax Act (No. 2)

Finance I should like to propose a way of proceeding with our discussion and perhaps the vote without asking the committee to pronounce itself on any particular item in this bill. This is to avoid some of the hassle that we had last night.

This bill has but two clauses. Clause 1 is composed of a number of parts, four to be exact. I suggest that we proceed with each of the subparagraphs at a time, from (1) to (4). We can then go to clause 2 of the bill. However, I make this exception. The four subparagraphs in subclause (1) can be handled together; they deal with manufacturing and processing. At the foot of page 5 of the bill there is a small subclause (2), which is merely transitional and consequential. Then the review procedure is dealt with at page 6 in subclause (3). Then follows clause 2 of the bill at the foot of page 6. That is the complete bill.

With all due deference, Mr. Chairman, the minister and I have agreed, and I think our hon. friends will agree with us, that this is the best way to proceed so we will not have any difficulties about calling the Chair back. I am sure you know what I mean.

The Chairman: I think the Chair understands what is proposed. The Chair has given some consideration as well to this problem. If this meets with the general agreement of the committee, it could be considered that the hon. member for Edmonton West has made his initial contribution on a point of order. Probably this is generally agreeable to the committee. We can then commence in the way he has suggested, that is by breaking down clause 1 into three different portions and dealing with each. Does the committee agree with that proposal?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising on the particular point of order?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to agree to this arrangement, but in view of the fact that these numbers are a bit confusing I wonder whether the situation could be clarified by indicating the pages we will be dealing with. I understand that what is suggested for our first discussion covers pages 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 down to paragraph (2). Is that correct?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Then try again.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I apologize; I thought I had given more precision to it. What I call block one is subparagraph (1) on page 1 of the bill, beginning at line 7, through to line 31 on page 2. Then starting at line 32 at page 2 through to line 33 on page 3 is block two. Line 34 on page 3 through to line 33 on page 5 is block three. Then the fourth block would be from line 1 on page 6 to line 28. Then I suppose you could say the fifth block is clause 2, which starts at line 29 on page 6.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Have you not forgotten the subclause right at the foot of page 5?