

*Excise Tax Act*

**Mr. Coates:** I was paired with the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Miss LaMarsh). Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the main motion?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

**Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern):** May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that the bill that has just been passed involves one of the prerogatives of the crown and therefore requires the consent of the crown before it can be given third reading in the house. I refer you, sir, to citation 283 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 231, fourth edition, where it is stated that the royal consent cannot be communicated in committee, is generally given at the third reading—

**Mr. Speaker:** I am very sorry but I will have to interrupt the hon. member. This point of order should have been raised before third reading was given. The house has voted on the matter and I must rule that the point has been settled.

**Mr. Nasserden:** With all due respect, sir, I believe I can give you authorities—

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry, but the authorities do not overrule the decision of the house.

**Mr. Nasserden:** I wonder if you would hold your decision, Mr. Speaker—

**EXCISE TAX ACT**

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (for the Minister of Finance)** moved the third reading of Bill No. C-90, to amend the Excise Tax Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Nasserden:** I should like to quote the authorities I have to offer you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know how I can express myself more clearly. I suggest that there has been a decision of the house which overrides all the authorities you care to quote.

**Mr. Nasserden:** I rose immediately after third reading, and I should like to quote the authorities I have in the rule books which I have before me.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to repeat arguments that were advanced

by members of the opposition regarding certain portions of this bill. I shall restrict myself, therefore, to moving, seconded by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan):

That this bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the committee of ways and means for the purpose of amending it to maintain the exemptions under the provisions of the excise tax from manufacturers sales tax on building materials and machinery, and machinery and apparatus to be used in manufacture or production.

It will be noted from what I have read what this amendment purports to do, and that is to ask for a direction that this bill be referred back to the committee of ways and means so that the sales tax provision in so far as it applies to building materials and machinery, and machinery and apparatus to be used in manufacture or production, shall not be altered.

**Mr. Stuart A. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I wish to emphasize why in my view it is most essential that the amendment be passed by the house. In the course of the debate on this bill I drew to the attention of the Minister of Finance the fear I had, that by imposing an 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and production machinery we might remove from all economic possibility of development the programs that are contemplated for the great river systems in British Columbia, and any other such river systems for the production of hydroelectric power.

I endeavour to emphasize the competing sources of power that are becoming rapidly available, and I endeavoured to emphasize what the addition of an 11 per cent tax would mean to an immense program such as the Columbia river project, which will cost \$400 million and more for the first stage alone. This is a sum identical to that which the government is seeking to secure for its municipal development fund, which is supposed to have the objective of eliminating unemployment in Canada.

I am not an authority on these questions, but I shall endeavour to quote an authority. I have asked a few questions on the order paper, which have remained unanswered, and in the course of debate I asked the Minister of Finance whether the government had considered the implications of this action on the Columbia river development. The minister answered a question put by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary, who asked if there had been representations from the province of British Columbia on this point, and he said that there had, that they had been considered, and rejected.

The whole point I am trying to find out is whether the government seriously considered