

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it has not been the practice to make public commercial contracts entered into between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and private organizations. Such practice would seriously inhibit effective business relationships because of the risk of disclosing confidential commercial information. Under the circumstances I would ask the Hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE BUILDING
OF HEAVY WATER PLANT, PORT HAWKESBURY

Motion No. 42—**Mr. Hogan:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Canadian General Electric concerning the building and operation of the heavy water plant at Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia since 1965.

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it has not been the practice to make public correspondence relating to commercial activities between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and private organizations. Such practice would seriously inhibit effective business relationships because of the risk of disclosing confidential commercial information. Under the circumstances I would ask the Hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO DRUG
CLINDAMYCIN

Motion No. 46—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, notices, etc. from the government to doctors, medical journals and medical colleges warning physicians of reports of deaths due to gastrointestinal bleeding caused by the drug clindamycin manufactured by Upjohn Company.

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is not acceptable to the government in that the government did not issue any correspondence, such as stated in the motion. However, the Upjohn Company consulted with officers of the health protection branch of the Department of National Health and Welfare in preparing their letters of August 26, 1974, and January 30, 1975. Furthermore, the department issued a news release to the media on both clindamycin and lincomycin on January 30, 1975. I therefore ask that the motion be withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Excise Tax Act

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

EXCISE TAX ACT

The House resumed, from Monday, July 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-66, to amend the Excise Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield. (p. 7416).

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, with great regret. Following the directions which the Chair gave yesterday with regard to the reprinting of this bill, I now have before me the reprinted bill. I find that in addition to the reprinting which was directed by the Chair, something new and foreign has been introduced.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Baldwin: While at first blush it seems minuscule, I think it shows, on close examination, the slovenly paper and scissors job done by the government when bringing in this bill. If Your Honour will turn to page 3 of the reprinted bill and page 3 of the original bill, you will find that in subparagraph (4) of the reprinted bill the following appears:

Where a person has purchased gasoline on which the tax imposed by part III has been paid and has recovered the cost of that gasoline, or any part thereof, from a person described in any of paragraphs (1)(a) to (f)—

I emphasize those letters, Mr. Speaker "(1)(a) to (f)". When we come to the original bill we find that the same subparagraph reads:

Where a person has purchased gasoline on which the tax imposed by part III has been paid and has recovered the cost of that gasoline, or any part thereof, from a person described in any of paragraphs (1)(a) to (j)—

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the beginnings of clause 5, section 47, one finds that there are in the original bill—which Your Honour found offensive and repugnant and ordered to be reprinted—subclauses (a) to (f), and that (j) is not apparent at all. I can readily imagine what happened. After a desperate struggle, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) got the bill, took it before cabinet, and I can speculate as to what happened. There were a number of exceptions, including those classes of the community who might be able to seek exemption from payment of the tax, and in the bill which the minister brought to cabinet—he can correct me if I am wrong, as I was not there—there were a number of exceptions from (a) to (j), the different groups which could be exempted from payment of the tax.

I pause to point out that this is not just a simple technical matter. Here we made a tax involving several hundreds of millions of dollars, and we have conditioned upon that tax the right of a number of people to secure, by the proper methods, exemptions of payments of this tax fundamental to the rights of this House in imposing tax measures at the request of the government and exempting certain classes from payment of the tax. That is what is involved in this issue. When we had the original bill before us, we had a bad bill for a number of reasons. One of the reasons was that we had a number of classes which