

[Translation]

DELAY IN ANSWERING QUESTION NO. 1,609

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As I advised the Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), my point of order deals with question No. 1,609 which appears on page 133 of the order paper for Monday, June 19, 1978, and which was put on it on May 5. Mr. Speaker, as this question should have been replied to as quickly as possible, in view of the existing dispute with regard to transport which opposes Quebec milk producers and the federal Department of Transport, which subsidizes part of transportation costs of the producers living east of Lévis in the province of Quebec; as this dispute does not seem to be close to a settlement, the producers met me again over the weekend and asked me the total amount of subsidies paid to the milk producers of that area with a view to finding an equitable solution with regard to the producers of other parts of the province of Quebec. Seeing that matter is extremely important, I should like to ask most sincerely and humbly if it might not be possible to get a reply as soon as possible to that question so that we can give an answer to those two categories of producers and so help them solve their problems as quickly as possible.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. STEVENS—COMMENTS OF MINISTER OF STATE (SMALL BUSINESS)

Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I rise concerning a question of privilege which I may be raising on Thursday or Friday afternoon. Your Honour will see from pages 6504 and 6505 of *Hansard* that the Minister of State (Small Business) (Mr. Abbott) made several comments reflecting on my ability to function as a member of parliament, and I believe I have a legitimate question of privilege, one I would propose to raise. I will give Your Honour due notice in the usual way should I decide to raise it on Thursday when the Minister of State for Small Business will, I am informed, be back in the House.

Income Tax Act GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed, from Friday, June 16, consideration in committee of the whole of Bill C-56, to amend the statute law relating to income tax to authorize payments related to provincial sales tax reductions—Mr. Chrétien—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose on Friday, June 16, 1978, clauses 6, 17 and 30 were allowed to stand, and clause 32 was before the committee.

On clause 32—“*Qualifying taxable dividends paid.*”

The Chairman: Is clause 32 agreed to?

● (1522)

[English]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Your Honour will recall that on Friday afternoon we moved to clause 31, which we passed, and we are presently on clause 32. However, I felt that it was at least implied that clause 30 would be returned to, pending a ruling on a procedural question regarding the amendment put by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West. I was wondering if that is the understanding. If we deal now with clause 32, will we be returning to clause 30 to hear Your Honour's ruling and then, presumably, to deal with clause 30 as the committee sees fit?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, may I say a word on the point of order which has been raised by the hon. member for York-Simcoe? When we agreed to stand clause 30 on Friday, which was done by unanimous consent, there was a request that we go back to some of the earlier clauses which had been stood. However, Your Honour ruled that we could not go back except by unanimous consent. I assume that that ruling stands.

We have gone forward to clause 32, and I think we should now go on to some of the other clauses. I say that, quite frankly, because if we go back to clause 30 we may be on it all day and never get to some of the others. I for one—and I am sure other hon. members in the House feel the same—would like to get to clause 34, which deal with registered retirement savings plans. I say, by way of indicating why, that there are many representations to us from credit unions about taxation at death of registered retirement savings plan funds, and I would like to get to that. My fear, if we go back to clause 30, is that we will be there all day, so I hope we will continue clause 32 and move on to clauses 33 and 34. I will not insist that we go through all 59 clauses, but I certainly want to get to clause 34 before we go back to clause 30.