

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair must advise the hon. member for Bow River that we should take these matters in order. Let us begin with the motion which asks to append to today's *Hansard* a copy of the trade agreement with New Zealand.

Mr. Lambert: As tabled by the minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The difficulty is that there is now a motion on the floor of the House, the one dealing with Bill C-90. In order to have the trade agreement vis-à-vis New Zealand appended to today's *Hansard*, the Chair requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Lambert: No, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): That unanimous consent may or may not exist. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Lambert: It does not require unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The hon. member for Edmonton West states that he feels it is not necessary to have unanimous consent, although there is another motion on the floor of the House. The Chair will take a couple of minutes to consult in that regard, but I do not think the hon. member is correct. My view is that there is one motion on the floor of the House at the moment and that another one cannot be entertained until such time—

Mr. Lambert: That is mine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): No, it is not the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton West which is on the floor at this time. It is the motion of the Minister of State for Finance that is on the floor at this point. If hon. members want to raise points of order, the Chair will hear them, but first I will take a couple of minutes to assure myself that I am correct in my interpretation in respect of the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton West. I think we ought not to have debate on a motion which has not yet been accepted by the Chair and about which, frankly, the Chair has serious doubt. If the hon. member is now seeking the floor on a point of order, I will hear it.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) who has had vast experience knows that we cannot have two motions on the floor but that we can amend the motion which is on the floor. I understood that the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton West was amending the motion—

Mr. Lambert: No.

Mr. Taylor:—by requesting that the agreement be appended to *Hansard*. I do not see anything wrong with this. The

Customs Tariff

agreement has been tabled and made public. Why should there be objection to other members having a copy of the agreement?

Mr. Pinard: Then ask for copies. It is tabled, it is public.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Apparently the matter is becoming more complex. I am aware that the Minister of State for Finance tabled the agreement with New Zealand. Now the hon. member for Bow River is asking whether or not it is available. Of course it is available. It has been tabled and is available to every hon. member of the House. Now, that matter is out of the way.

I should like to turn to the issue raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West. He did not put to the Chair a motion to amend the bill, which he might have done. He put a motion to the House asking that this particular agreement be appended to *Hansard*. It is not a motion to amend the bill; it is a motion seeking the unanimous consent of the House to append the agreement to *Hansard*. It requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the appending of that trade agreement to *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lambert: They do not know what they are talking about.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Therefore it will not be appended to *Hansard*.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting with bated breath to participate in this exciting debate on Bill C-90, an act to amend the Customs tariff and to repeal certain acts in consequence thereof. If anyone in the country reads a copy of today's proceedings in *Hansard* or happens to view these proceedings on television, it will become very clear why the popularity of and esteem for politicians are so abysmally low. Bill C-90 deals with some very important matters in terms of imports and exports, but it is bogged down in parliamentary procedure and wrangling. I do not only cast my critical comments on my colleagues on my right but on those across the aisle as well. We listened to the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussières) read from a prepared text some straightforward, rather simplistic comments about the bill.

Mr. Laniel: They were very interesting and to the point.

Mr. Riis: They were very interesting, but there was nothing new. Then the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) raised the issue that there were documents we should have received to make the debate meaningful. In listening to the Minister of State for Finance, I do not think his contribution was particularly meaningful. This is no reflection upon him, necessarily; it is just the way things operate. In listening to the previous speaker, I was not particularly moved by any insight into the importance of the document. To put it simply, we have not had time or the necessary documentation in order to prepare. It almost begs the question as to why we go through this routine and whether or not it is an appropriate