

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I sort of divine the purport of the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. I do not want to get into the substance but, quite frankly, I am not aware of the wording of the motion which I gather is on a very serious, fundamental, substantive subject. As far as I am concerned, not being involved in these House discussions, I am a little leery of giving consent.

I think the House leader for the government was proper in his initial reply to say that he wanted to discuss whatever the suggestion was with caucus members. All the parties are going to meet in caucus tomorrow. If we then know that it is one word changed or three words changed, or whatever the substance of the motion, then obviously, undoubtedly, we will have a debate.

But until this member knows what we are talking about, I refuse to give consent in a vacuum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Therefore, there is not unanimous consent. Orders of the Day.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on a point of order.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I just wanted to very briefly make sure that the House understood what it is that you were asking unanimous consent for. It seems that some members were under the mistaken impression that unanimous consent was being sought for the purposes of introducing a motion.

Unanimous consent was being sought by the member for Ottawa—Vanier for the purpose of reverting to the procedure in Routine Proceedings to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, a point under Standing Order 52. Perhaps the House was not quite clear on that, and it would assist if the House were reminded. I hope that unanimous consent can then be achieved.

• (1250)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I believed that everyone was aware that the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier has risen twice now in the last couple of days in order to bring his motion under Standing Order 52 for an emergency debate. But I can ask for unanimous consent again. Is there unanimous consent?

### *Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is not unanimous consent. Orders of the Day.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### EXCISE TAX ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, February 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-62, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Criminal Code, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Excise Act, the Income Tax Act, the Statistics Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance; and the amendment of Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra) (p. 7569).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville has the floor.

The hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan on a point of order.

**Mr. Angus:** Mr. Speaker, if you will remember, on a previous occasion the Speaker ruled that following the speech of hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt the House did have an opportunity for a 10-minute question and answer period. That decision was rendered after the normal scheduled time for the House to have the opportunity to question the hon. member.

I am wondering, Sir, since the member is in the House, if this is the appropriate time to see whether the House has any questions for the member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, on the understanding that this in no way affects the rotation in which you will call the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Minister of Justice and Government House Leader.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate, on behalf of the government, that the government is always prepared to debate this particular bill. The hon. member who now sought to have questions put to a member because that member is in the House is the same hon. member who participated in the decision in his caucus to move a motion to concur in a motion and thereby delay debate in the House. I think, once and for all, the New