

only going to make it more cumbersome. In the long run, the way it operates now works out reasonably well. If it is felt that on a continuing basis the government is abusing that privilege, however, surely hon. members can raise that objection and ask what the reason is for the tabling. If it is not the length of it, then on individual occasions that objection can be raised.

In any case if that procedure is to be changed greatly from the way the Standing Order is now written and the way hon. members on both sides of the House have accepted it for quite some time, surely that ought to be a question for consideration by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization as opposed to a rather ad hoc change made by the Chair. The procedure is well established, it is well written in the rules, and if it is to be changed then hon. members ought to agree on the changes to be made.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, may I make a comment that might be of some value? It would seem to me that the great problem for members who have put down starred questions is that they do not know, until the parliamentary secretary suddenly makes a statement proposing that the answer be made an order for return rather than answered orally, whether the answer will be of such length as to lend itself to being made an order for return. I would like to suggest that perhaps the parliamentary secretary could give a signal in advance to members whose questions are going to be answered but whose questions or starred questions are going to be the subject of an application for an order for return, and then it could be considered whether their objections were in order. Too often we do not get that opportunity.

**Mr. Speaker:** The point made by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) is well taken and in one or another form it has been suggested previously. It would, of course, require no amendments or changes to the practices and procedures of the House nor to Standing Orders. It is evident, of course, that when the parliamentary secretary comes into the House with the answers ready for each day, he knows at least an hour in advance what procedure he will follow, so that it might be a simple matter to notify the House leaders. In turn they could notify the members involved with the particular questions, and so they would be prepared in advance in that way. I think that suggestion would be well worth consideration by both sides.

\* \* \*

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all notices of motions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the notices of motions stand?

**Some hon Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Forrestall:** I rise on a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, that follows those already raised. I wonder if I could bring it to the attention of the parliamentary secre-

## Excise Tax Act

tary in light of the attitude and declared position of the Chairman of the National Harbours Board, who has indicated that the document being sought could very well be made public. Indeed he undertook to send it to me three months ago. My notices have been on the order paper since April 9, three months ago today. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary could have someone on his staff look at that and determine whether this document cannot be made available to us so that I will not have to get up in a week or ten days' time on a question of privilege or a point of order and tear hell out of the government for trying to hide, and using evasive tactics with respect to the document that may or may not be embarrassing to it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### EXCISE TAX ACT

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-66, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is almost standing practice on the presentation of budget bills since 1971 when the matter first arose. There is lengthy debate reported in *Hansard* for September of that year in connection with Bill C-259. I indicated at that time that the bill violated Standing Order 60(11), and I indicate now in regard to Bill C-66 that it flagrantly violates Standing Order 60(11) and is therefore an imperfect bill, and it is not possible to introduce it under Standing Order 69.

I do not want to go into the details of Bill C-259 in 1971. Your Honour was parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council at that time and is well aware of what transpired, and of the tacit ruling the Chair made, because an order of the House was made to correct all of the difficulties that had arisen. I want to point out to the minister and the House that we now have a similar occasion.

I say that Bill C-66 transgresses on three points the ways and means resolution introduced at the time of the budget. Standing Order 60(11) provides:

● (1520)

The adoption of any Ways and Means motion shall be an order to bring in a bill or bills based on the provisions of any such motion.

In other words, the motion on this occasion is not expressed in a general way; it is expressed in draft bill form. Paragraph 3 of the ways and means motion, as it appears in *Votes and Proceedings* of June 23, 1975, is a draft amendment to Part VI of the Excise Tax Act. Specifically that part proposes to introduce to the act new section 47. That deals with the rebate of the new tax of 10 cents on gasoline.