

Excise Tax

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is now on motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

That automatically defers motions Nos. 25 and 26.

I would ordinarily move next to motions Nos. 27 and 28, but I have had the opportunity, as I promised the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) to examine the Speaker's ruling with respect to motion No. 10 and I find that he is quite correct. Madam Speaker seems to have indicated in her ruling that he should be encouraged, if he sees fit, to make procedural arguments on his motion. It might be more convenient for everyone if the hon. member would give that argument now, if he is prepared to do so, and then, on the next day Bill C-57 is debated, the Chair would be prepared to give a ruling immediately.

The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) rises on a point of order?

Mr. Lambert: Just a question of timing, Mr. Speaker. Even if the hon. member finishes his argument, you would not call motions Nos. 27 or 28 tonight? The reason I ask is that I am 45 minutes late on a very pressing engagement and if I have to wait 15 minutes until six o'clock, it just makes it worse. I am just asking whether we are going to get to motion No. 27. If not, then will we defer it until the following day?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Well, as the House knows, the Speaker has invited all hon. members to attend a party this evening. I cannot make a ruling as to when it is six

o'clock, but if hon. members want to accommodate the hon. member for Edmonton West, what we can do is to hear the point of order on motion No. 10 and then perhaps the Chair can seek consent of the House to call it six o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Collenette: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat confused because as I understand it, Madam Speaker was talking about the grouping of these amendments and she said that motion No. 10 standing in the name of the hon. member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) seeks to import a new proposition and offends the royal recommendation attached to the bill. Then she went on to quote citations 437(1), 773(7) and 516(2) of Beauchesne's fifth edition, and then she went on to say that the hon. member may wish to offer arguments on the acceptability of his motion, and if so, he can do that the next time the bill is before the House.

● (1750)

I seek guidance from the Chair. Is this a ruling? If so, one should not argue about it and the motion should be stricken. Or, is this a suggestion that there are doubts? Certainly the language used seeks to import a new proposition and offends the royal recommendation; that is very clear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have interpreted Madam Speaker's ruling in favour of the wider rights of the hon. member. If I were to disregard the words, "the hon. member may wish to offer argument on the procedural acceptability", then in effect I would make those words useless and deny the hon. member any right he may have had under Madam Speaker's ruling. The fact that these words exist leads me to believe that the hon. member now has a right to make procedural argument.

Mr. Riis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity. I recall clearly that the intent of Madam Speaker's ruling was that one would have an opportunity to raise the issue at the appropriate time in the proceedings. In an effort to convince the Chair that in fact it is procedurally appropriate, I will begin by referring to the background which led me to bring forward this motion at the encouragement of my colleagues.

If one were to look at the manner in which the government has supported the Canadian small business sector, it would be anything but impressive.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I ask the hon. member to restrict himself as narrowly as possible to the point of order on the acceptability of the motion.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your point. A number of delegations brought this point to our attention in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, that is, that we were asking the business community to collect taxes on behalf of the federal government. We felt we would bring the matter forward on their behalf at this particular time