

*Order Paper Questions*

ending March 31: 1972/73, \$1,080 million surplus; 1973/74, \$223 million surplus; 1974/75, \$194 million deficit.

NOTE: However, the United States-Canada Trade Statistics Committee, composed of trade statisticians from the two countries, has reconciled difference between the bilateral trade figures published by Statistics Canada and by the U.S. Census Bureau in order to arrive at mutually accepted measures of the trade balance according to a consistent conceptual framework. These reconciled figures are available for calendar years only. For the calendar years 1972 and 1973 Statistics Canada reported Canadian surpluses of \$1.1 billion and \$0.6 billion respectively, while the Committee's reconciled figures for these years are \$1.5 billion and \$1.2 billion respectively. An estimate for 1974 will be available later in May.

\* \* \*

**QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN****METRIC COMMISSION**

Question No. 2,218—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. For the period January 1, 1973 to date, by month, how much money was spent by the government in general and the Metric Commission in particular, on advertising all aspects of Metric Conversion?
2. In each case (a) by name and location, which individuals or companies handled such advertising (b) how was the money disbursed in (i) print (ii) radio (iii) television (iv) other?
3. For the same period, by month, name and location, which individuals, companies and/or departments were employed as consultants?
4. In each case, what was the (a) financial or other remuneration given for services (b) nature of such services (c) time involved in giving such services?

Return tabled.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege with respect to a starred question that has been on the order paper since March 4 this year. I am aware that there is no requirement under Standing Order 39 for any new treatment of questions posed to the treasury benches. There is, nevertheless, a long-standing tradition in this House that starred questions indicate urgency in the minds of the hon. members posing them. It is three months since this question was placed on the order paper. I am totally satisfied with the competence of the public servants involved to prepare an answer quickly for the minister, and I should like an assurance from the parliamentary secretary that the matter will be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.

[Mr. Clermont.]

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT****AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEFINITIONS, POWERS OF INVESTIGATORS, OFFENCES**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-2, to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Bank Act and to repeal an act to amend an act to amend the Combines Investigation Act and the Criminal Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members will realize that 25 motions have been filed at the report stage of this bill. This gives rise to a number of considerations in terms of grouping, procedural acceptability, discussion and voting. After some consideration and preliminary examination at least, and subject to whatever comments may be made during the course of consideration, it is the view of the Chair that motions Nos. 1 to 5 do not seem to pose any procedural problems on the face of it; neither do they lend themselves particularly to grouping for discussion. Accordingly, it would be the intention of the Chair to call motions Nos. 1 to 5 individually.

There was a question in respect of motion No. 1 concerning the addition by that motion of a new concept in the bill, adding what is essentially a definition section by the inclusion of another term, "parliamentary committee". Because of the rather restrictive nature of the particular section and its restricted application, it really does not fall within the objection of attempting to amend the entire bill by way of changing the definition. Since the committee or boards or commissions referred to in that section are only there as a source of inspiration to the director in terms of his considerations about competition, it would appear to the Chair that the benefit of the doubt ought to be given to the hon. member who proposed the motion in order that he might have an opportunity to have the concept discussed.

Similarly, motion No. 7 appears to amend the penalty provisions of the bill itself. That gives me some concern because clause 14 of the bill amends or repeals certain provisions of paragraphs 32(1)(a) to (d) of the original statute, the Combines Investigation Act. Clause 14 of the bill does not amend the actual penalty section. Having repealed and replaced the subsections which define the offence, the provisions of the bill do not go on to repeal or in any way to amend that part of the statute having to do with the actual imposition of the penalty for an indictable offence.

● (1510)

On the other hand, since the amendment set out in clause 14 of the bill seeks to amend the very definitions of offences in relation to the sections involved, it certainly seems to the Chair, after consideration, that although the amendment proposed as motion No. 7 may give rise to some concern it does not go beyond what is ordinarily involved in an amendment and, since the amending statute has redefined the very offences with which the act is concerned, it ought to be open to a member to suggest that