

duced and, on the other, to show cause why the papers should not or may not be produced. When the debate ranges widely, the rule of relevance is certainly being disregarded, and in some cases with a considerable amount of abandonment. The Chair has a duty to members to call this to their attention and request that they restrict their comments to the contents of the motion.

Mr. Blais: I fully agree, Mr. Speaker. All I was trying to do was follow in the footsteps of the hon. member for Winnipeg North. He brought the topic to the attention of the House at this time. He talked about salaries of public servants. I thought I could do the same in a more detailed manner. I say that because the hon. member for Winnipeg North knows full well that the information he is seeking is documentation that is obtained from the Pay Research Bureau. He knows that all information deposited with the Pay Research Bureau is confidential. If not, it would dry up. He also knows that without the Pay Research Bureau there cannot be honest labour negotiations. The hon. member supports that. If he recognizes that, why is he bringing this motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

REPRESENTATIONS FROM MANITOBA INDIAN BROTHERHOOD

Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions through the usual channels resulting in unanimous consent to move the following motion and to have it put to the House:

That the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development be authorized to hear representations from the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood.

I so move.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I second the motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to have the hon. member second the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Before calling it six o'clock, is it agreed that the House return to committee of the whole in order that we might facilitate procedures for this evening?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Excise

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

EXCISE TAX ACT AND EXCISE ACT

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-40, to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Penner in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m. this evening.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order please. When the committee rose at six o'clock it was considering clause 18 of Bill C-40, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act, to which an amendment had been moved by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources which was stood at that time. I imagine the committee is still considering clause 18 of the bill. Is the committee ready to proceed?

[Translation]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Chairman, though the interpretation of clause 18 may still lend itself to discussion, we could perhaps go on to clause 19. The minister's reply satisfies me. Unless someone else wants to pursue the discussion of that clause... As for me, I am satisfied. I shall bring it up again some other time. So, we could now go on to clause 19, pass it, then move on to clause 20 which merely provides for the abrogation of the present act. From there we could go on to clause 21, and avoid holding up the business of the House.

[English]

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Chairman, I understand clause 18 was stood because there was some apprehension about it when we reached it. It might be that we should carry clause 18. I may say to the hon. member for Moncton that, on checking over the supper hour, I have been informed that reservoirs are also included within the category to which he referred. The clause refers to complete water distribution systems.

Mr. Jones: If that is true then perhaps the parliamentary secretary and the minister are cognizant of the difference, but is the bureaucracy in the Department of National Revenue aware of the situation?

Mr. Cullen: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I understand the interpretation was received from that department, so there is no confusion. We felt that if the clause were phrased so as to include such things as feeder lines, and so on, the whole page would be full of terminology. Therefore, we think the general words cover the whole situation, and this is confirmed by the department.

The Chairman: Is the parliamentary secretary suggesting that we proceed with clause 18 or stand it?