

"vessel" and have used "boat". Here they have qualified "boat" by substituting "purchased or imported by Her Majesty in right of Canada for use exclusively by the government of Canada". The words "purchased or imported by" are completely new. There is no such qualification in the ways and means motion. The idea of ownership is completely new. The motion does not refer to ownership at all. The bill brings in ownership and use. The boat must be purchased or imported by Her Majesty for the exclusive use of the Canadian government. Not only do the technical words differ between the motion and the bill, the concepts have changed.

● (1540)

I would also point out the obvious difference in the French version between the use of the words "navires de guerre" in the motion and the word "navire" in the bill. The English and French versions differ even in the motion. One uses "boat, other than naval vessels", the other "bateaux, autres que les navires de guerre". In the Bill, the word "boat" is used in the general and in the particular, but in the French version the general word is "bateaux", while the exception is "navires".

In the end result, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that item 11 in the bill does not comply with the requirements of Standing Order 60(11), and must be struck out as not based upon the relevant item in the budget motion.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member and the overworked research staff of the opposition on putting together that particular argument. The hon. member has made his case on second reading when his colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), said he should make it. Unless Your Honour wants to rule at this stage, perhaps we could argue the point when we get to the specific clause. In any event I should like to have the opportunity of examining the argument of the hon. member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. At this time the Chair has to decide whether there is a point of order, and not with regard to the goodwill of the minister. What the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker) has said confirms the first impression the Chair had. The hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is aware that the motion before the House at this time is that the bill be read the second time and referred to the committee. I do not see how he could expect the Chair to rule on a motion to delete a clause of the bill at this stage of second reading without having that specific clause before the House. At this time the whole bill is before the House.

I see that the hon. member for Edmonton-West (Mr. Lambert) seems to be attempting to rise. He had the opportunity to stand up and make his case earlier. At this time the House is considering the whole bill, and I do not feel it can be amended at this stage of second reading. I cannot accept the argument of the hon. member that I should make a decision on a motion to delete item 11 at this time when that clause is not really before the House, but will be before the Committee of the Whole at a later stage. For these reasons I cannot accept the point of order raised by the hon. member.

Excise

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The Speaker has made his ruling.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The Speaker has made his ruling, and I say that is unfortunate because the same point of order arose at the time Bill C-259 was introduced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would remind the hon. member that he had the opportunity to intervene during the procedural debate but did not do so.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Oh, I beg your pardon!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not think the hon. member should have the right to make a further comment on the acceptability of the ruling after it has been made. For that reason I suggest that we proceed with the debate.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we should take one thing at a time. My colleague was raising a point of order. Your Honour intervened and, in effect, suggested that he should not be doing that. I suggested to Your Honour, without disclosing what the hon. member was going to say, that it was right that he should do so at this time. Your Honour did not give me the opportunity to speak on the merits of what he was saying. I could not speak on the merits of what he was going to say because he had not said it.

It was for that reason I indicated my desire to rise in order to draw Your Honour's attention to a very valid and compelling precedent, namely, the decision of Mr. Speaker Lamoureux on precisely the same point in respect of Bill C-259. The bill introduced did not conform with the ways and means motion, and steps had to be taken to correct it. That is all we are concerned with now—correcting the discrepancy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Cyril Synes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to address myself to the subject matter of the item referred to in the point of order. I want to examine the item and its content, namely a provision for a 10 per cent tax on boat motors over 20 horsepower. I notice that the minister is here and that a half a dozen officials from his department are in the gallery.

I, too, have received representations from marine dealers, and I should like to lay some of their arguments before the House with the hope that the minister will listen carefully, as I think they make a great deal of sense.

The point is that the 10 per cent tax on boat motors of over 20 horsepower will have a detrimental effect not only on the marine business but also on tourist operators and commercial fishermen in northern Ontario. When I look at the tax I must ask myself why the minister brought it in. I can only conclude that this was an attempt to reduce energy consumption, and that the tax was viewed as a luxury tax in that these boats are used primarily for recreation. On an examination of this matter I would dispute that the tax will have the desired effect.