

The original proposal, which was to eliminate taxation, as such, of insurance companies, or a portion thereof, under part XV of the act, and to transfer the burden of taxation to the beneficiaries as their policies matured, resulted in better cash flow for the insurance companies. I agree that taxing the profits of insurance companies on a multinational basis might somehow result in double taxation in that the government of Canada taxes as earned income proceeds from foreign-held policies. But what puzzles me is: What has been the change in the burden of taxation on life insurance companies as between the companies and their policyholders? Since a large number of Canadian insurance companies are mutual companies, we are taking money out of the right pocket instead of the left pocket.

If corporate revenues are taxed more, this will mean there is less money available to be added to the value of policies in the hands of participating policyholders. The shareholders of mutual insurance companies receive no profits because they are themselves the policyholders. The beauty of the insurance industry is that they are Canadians. The former minister of finance recognized the sterility and illogicality of his move to tax as earned income proceeds from insurance policies, insurance being a means of saving, and belatedly, after receiving representations and he and I having discussed the matter in committee, he came in with a threshold figure. This eliminated a good deal of the incidence of taxation of beneficiaries under insurance policies. This proposal has now been dropped, except that if one reads the minister's proposals regarding taxation of insurance companies—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills. Then at six o'clock the House will take into consideration the adjournment motion.

● (1702)

It being five o'clock, we will proceed to private members' hour. The first order is No. 2, but I have been advised there was some understanding and agreement among members that, by unanimous consent, motions Nos. 2 to 9 would be stood, and the House would proceed with motion No. 10 appearing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

[Translation]

Is the House ready, as suggested to the Chair, to defer the study of motions Nos. 2 to 9 and proceed immediately with motion No. 10 in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I have risen before on this subject. The rules of the House state that all items standing on the orders of the day shall be taken up according to precedent assigned to each order of the day. This is the second time in this session of parliament that motions have been called, and it

Private Members' Business

is my understanding that if certain motions are to be stood, it is being done possibly in accordance with Standing Order 19(1).

However, I should like to draw to the attention of the Chair Standing Order 49(1), which states clearly that when a private member's notice of motion shall be called by the Chair twice and not proceeded with, it shall be dropped. This is the second time notices of motions Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been called from the chair. I would request that the next time the motions are called, presumably next week, there be clarification from the Chair of the apparent discrepancy between Standing Order 19(1) and Standing Order 49(1), so that members will know whether we are to follow the order as it appears on the order paper or whether there is to be some other agreement of which we are not aware which would not enable us to prepare for a particular motion to be brought up at the time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will have noticed, of course, that the Chair took it upon itself to refer to unanimous consent that had been brought to the Chair's attention. Normally, I think this initiative should have come from the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), his parliamentary secretary, or the Acting President of the Privy Council. These agreements are made between the parties, and I think the Chair should stay out of them.

Perhaps the hon. member is raising a valid point, in the sense that if House leaders cannot agree on organizing the work of the House, they should not expect the Chair to do the job for them. At the same time, the Chair would have no alternative, then, but to call the orders one by one. The hon. member will admit that when the notices of motions to which he has referred are called, they are stood at the request of the government. Thus, according to Standing Order 19, they retain their place.

At the same time, unanimous consent was given. If the hon. member does not wish to give unanimous consent at this time, my interpretation of the rules would be that these notices of motions would be considered as having been called once, and that the next time they are called, if not proceeded with they will disappear from the order paper unless there is a specific request from the government that they stand.

[Translation]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. There is this specific request by the government to stand the other motions and keep them on the order paper until they are called again.

[English]

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that these items come up during private members' hour. Whether a notice of motion is called depends, really, on the wish of the member who has placed the notice on the order paper. It is not for the government to say whether a member should bring forward a notice of motion or a bill. What the government does in this case is facilitate arrangements, which private members have made. The procedure, really, is one of finding out whether members are prepared to proceed with their