

2. In each case, what were the amounts of fees paid to each?
3. In each case, did any lawyer or firm receive fees exceeding \$5,000 and, if so, what were the names of such lawyers or firms and the amount of fees paid to each?

Return tabled.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of informing the House, it is the government's intention to proceed with Bill C-58, and if that bill should be completed, all the votes will be deferred until Monday, I would suggest at eight o'clock in the evening. We would then proceed to Bill C-68, which is the medicare act.

Mr. Baldwin: That is perfectly all right, Mr. Speaker. However, in light of the very interesting exchange which took place a little while ago between the hon. parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Leeds, the hon. member might like to have Bill C-82 introduced and we could then see what sort of legal argument he is able to make.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, if we dealt with Bill C-82, the facts would come to light and we would destroy all the publicity the hon. member for Leeds might have gained.

Mr. Baldwin: Why don't you do it, then?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the statements made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council do follow from our discussions, but it seems to me there is one point that was not made clear and which perhaps should be explained. When the parliamentary secretary suggested that when the debate finishes today the votes would be deferred until Monday, should it not be clear that we cannot proceed with the discussion of motions Nos. 5 and 6 until there has been a vote on motion No. 4, both the amendment and the motion itself? In other words, we are not in a position simply to wind up the debate today and say we will take all the votes on Monday night. After there has been a vote on motion No. 4 we will still have motions Nos. 5 and 6 to deal with.

● (1210)

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, that point ought to have been made clear and I thank the hon. gentleman for having done so.

Mr. Speaker: It may very well be that it ought to be made clear. However, it has not been. The fact is that it is not possible even to consider the procedural regularity of motion No. 5 unless and until the House has made a determination on motion No. 4. It may very well be, after our division on motion No. 4, that motion No. 5 cannot continue on the order paper. Therefore, the House will recall that when discussion on motion No. 4 was completed, discussion on motion No. 5 was deferred until that division can be taken, and motion No. 6 was stood.

The House could either go on, presumably, to discuss any outstanding motions which remain, or else go to some

Non-Canadian Publications

other business until such time as the House divides on motion No. 4, which I understand, and which I take it is agreed to by the House, will in any event not take place this day. In other words, if the discussion on the motions presently before the House concludes today, the House will defer any divisions until some time on Monday and then either go to motions other than Nos. 5 and 6 or to some other business. Is that agreed?

Mr. Blais: That is the understanding that has been reached between the parties, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cossitt: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, stemming from what the parliamentary secretary said just a moment ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In the interest of fairness, comments about the bill that were referred to by the parliamentary secretary were made by him by way of a non-point of order. I therefore permitted the hon. member for Leeds to make a lengthy rejoinder, in a sense of fair play. The non-point of order was not raised by the parliamentary secretary but by the House leader of the official opposition. I permitted a very brief comment by the parliamentary secretary. All of them were non-points of order, and I have no intention of letting it go on as a discussion between the parties about the merits of that particular piece of legislation. Orders of the day.

Mr. Cossitt: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say I did not rise on anything pertaining to the bill itself or anything said previously. I was rising in respect of a statement made by the parliamentary secretary that if he were to proceed with the introduction of this bill he would therefore be destroying the publicity that I, as the member for Leeds, was getting out of raising this matter. I think that is a completely ridiculous, uncalled-for an unwarranted statement. I have raised a matter of grave concern to thousands of my constituents and the people of Ontario who are being robbed by the government of approximately \$25 million. To be told—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thought I made it clear to the hon. member for Leeds that I allowed him to go quite considerably beyond the bounds of ordinary procedure in making a rather complex statement on what I thought was a rather full statement about the matter, on a non-point of order, and I think the matter ought to end there. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 11, consideration of Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act, as