Mr. Boudria: It's a reference to committee.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): It is not a hoist? I am sorry then. My objection remains. It is simply this. The hoist amendment and the referral amendment are in essence boring. It is these boring dilatory formulations with which this House has been afflicted on several questions now during this session.

I, for one, would like to take this opportunity to urge my friends in the Liberal Party if they are going to continue to propose dilatory motions at various readings to move more into reasoned amendments. Reasoned amendments have about them the advantage of a certain political *joie de vivre* in that they are almost without exception the opportunity to propose exactly why it is that the bill before the House is execrable and ought not to be proceeded with. This lends to the debate in such instances a certain focus—

Mr. Walker: Slow down. We can't keep up with you. What was that word?

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** Am I to put up with this harassment, Madam Speaker?

If I may be allowed to proceed, I would only say and emphasize, if I may, that the reasoned amendment is a course that I would commend to my Liberal friends in the House. This one, for example, was perfectly susceptible to a reasoned amendment dealing with the increase in the manufacturers sales tax from 12 per cent to 13.5 per cent. It was the perfect opportunity to place a substantive objection before the House in the form of a reasoned amendment and thereby stimulate, as is to be hoped, some reasonable, intelligent, even dare I say it, passionate debate on that question. But, no, once again we have the tepid, flaccid, in most respects pointless dilatory motion to refer to a committee. I ask you, Madam Speaker: in the array of devices available to a parliamentarian in this House, there are few that could be deemed more boring. It is unfortunate that this is the sort of material given by the Liberal caucus to this House for this House to deal with.

• (1920)

Having said that, I would just say, of course we will support this dilatory motion, because it is—

Mr. Boudria: It is not a dilatory motion.

Mr. Peterson: It is a hoist.

## Government Orders

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): The Liberals cannot agree among themselves. I will grant them that it makes it somewhat less boring.

Mr. Walker: It is a reference.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Now it is a reference. This is getting better all the time.

In conclusion, I would just say that we will support the motion because it is implicitly, at least, a rejection of the bill. That is to its credit. That is all that is to its credit, but it is to its credit.

I think I can safely say on behalf of all of my colleagues here that the bill before the House enjoys no support in this caucus. I assume it enjoys none in that caucus. Perhaps now we can get to the vote.

Mr. Walker: Madam Speaker, perhaps since you are also from Alberta, you can just translate what we have just heard so we can better understand what took place.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Sparrow): I might have just as much difficulty as you.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, for the benefit of our colleague who was commenting on a subject which he obviously had not seen or heard, perhaps I could take this opportunity to read the amendment to him so that in the future he will at least know what it was that he was talking about earlier tonight.

Effectively, the motion we moved earlier tonight was the following:

That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following:

That Bill C-20, an Act to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to a legislative committee for reconsideration of Clause 8(1)

I just want my colleague to know what it was that he made his speech about. It is always nice to go back home and be able to explain to one's constituents just what one was saying.

Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that kind elucidation, although I must say the point remains. The motion lacks the pith and passion that might otherwise be present in a proper reasoned amendment.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Sparrow): Is the House ready for the question?