

Cargo Carrying Vehicles

Truck, stake, 3 ton	100
Truck Cargo, 1 ton, 4x2 (with extended cab)	125
Truck Cargo, 1 ton, 4x4 (with extended cab)	22
Truck Cargo, 1 ton, 4x4	200
Miscellaneous Cargo carrying vehicles and trailers, ½ ton to 5 ton (excluding the above vehicle types)	110

Sub Total 557

Specialized wheeled vehicles such as cranes, tankers, aircraft servicing vehicles and fire trucks	70
Engineer, construction and maintenance vehicles (including tractors, loaders scoop type, dump trucks, snow removal vehicles and graders)	77
Wheeled powered materials handling vehicles including forklifts, pallet trucks, warehouse tractors and cranes	79

Grand Total 1,155

2. No.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—PASSENGER RESERVATION SERVICES

Question No. 3,248—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. Did the Department of National Defence sign a contract with Air Canada for passenger reservation services on the Air Canada computer at a cost of \$1,866,662?

2. Was the average in 1974, 25 percent on a number of available seats and, if so, what government action has been undertaken to optimize possible dollar savings?

3. Does the Department of National Defence book passenger reservations on an individual basis and, if not, would it be more economically efficient to do so?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes.

2. As stated in reply to Question No. 1,951 (*Hansard* 110, page 4767, dated March 14, 1975) approximately 23 per cent of the total available seats were not used. The contract with Air Canada will enable the Department to significantly improve seat utilization with consequent dollar savings.

3. Yes.

LAWYERS RETAINED BY GOVERNMENT IN CONSTITUENCY OF VICTORIA, B.C.

Question No. 3,265—**Mr. McKinnon:**

1. What were the names and addresses of all lawyers and law firms in the Constituency of Victoria, British Columbia who performed services for the government in 1973 and 1974?

2. By year, what was the total amount paid to each?

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1 and 2. See Question No. 3,096 of July 30, 1975.

Time Allocation Motion

[English]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME ALLOCATION MOTION WITH RESPECT TO BILL C-58

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp:

That, in relation to Bill C-58, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, five hours shall be allotted to the further consideration of the second reading stage of the bill; and

That, at the expiry of the fifth such hour, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding before the House, if required for the purpose of this order, and shall forthwith put, without further debate or amendment, every question necessary for the disposal of the second reading stage of the bill.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I propose this motion with reluctance because it had been my hope that the parties would agree to allocate time for the conclusion of the second reading debate on Bill C-58. I approached the House leader of the official opposition with this in mind and he advised me that he could not agree, on behalf of his party, to a time allocation of any kind. A motion under Standing Order 75A therefore became impossible. I thereupon approached the House leader of the New Democratic Party, who informed me that he would have been ready to participate with all the other parties in a motion under Standing Order 75A, but he was not authorized to join with the government in a motion under Standing Order 75B.

Because of the pressure of other legislation and the long period during which Bill C-58 had been discussed at second reading, the government felt that it should take the responsibility for bringing the second reading motion to a vote within a reasonable time. I remind the House that already there have been 47 speakers on Bill C-58 and they have expended a total of six days in their speeches. This motion allocates another five hours of debate, equivalent to at least another full sitting day. This will enable another seven or eight speakers to participate if they wish to speak for the maximum period of 40 minutes each, and a good many more if the speakers are content to limit their speeches to a shorter period, say 20 minutes. I doubt, therefore, if anyone could accuse the government of having unduly limited the expression of opinion by hon. members on this piece of legislation at the second reading stage.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: Indeed, the government may be open to the charge of having let the debate drift on too long before taking its responsibility and bringing second reading to a vote.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!