

the bases for project decisions of a questionable nature, and to recommend to the House a set of guidelines and principles which would give the representatives of the Canadian people more control over the spending of the taxpayers' dollars on the programs involved.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to the motion proposed by the hon. member?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity; the motion cannot be put.

* * *

TAXATION

SALES TAX REMISSION TO GREAT CANADIAN OIL SANDS LIMITED—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I should like to seek the permission of the House to move a motion of urgent and pressing necessity, namely, the decision of the government to remit \$6 million in sales taxes to Great Canadian Oil Sands Limited. In view of the fact that there was supposed to be a question of need and the company was supposed to be poverty-stricken, whereas subsequently it was discovered that the same company also applied for and received a remission of royalties from the province of Alberta, and as it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Sun Oil Company of Philadelphia, whose net revenues were \$152 million—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows the rule. He is required to put the motion without argument or debate.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I had just reached the point of proposing the motion, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

That the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—

This committee was chosen deliberately because justice is needed here.

—be authorized to inquire into the decision of the government to remit \$6 million in sales taxes to Great Canadian Oil Sands Limited with particular reference to (1) the public interest (2) the remission of royalties by the Alberta government, and (3) the financial position of Great Canadian Oil Sands Limited and its relationship to Sun Oil Company of Philadelphia as well as to the financial position of the said Sun Oil Company.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House give unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity; the motion cannot be put.

25020—27

Family Income Security

FAMILY INCOME SECURITY

IMMEDIATE PRESENTATION OF LEGISLATION—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 I should like the consent of the House to present a motion. The government appears to have given low priority again to the proposed family income security plan, even though we on this side of the House had offered to sit for an extra week.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to take exception to the kind of motion which is now proposed by the hon. member. Hon. members know that Standing Order 43 is a very exceptional Standing Order. If the government were to take advantage of the Standing Order in the way private members are doing, I think there would be a great hue and cry that the government was trying to propose motions without giving due notice. The only justification for the submission of a motion under Standing Order 43 is that the matter in question is of such urgency that the time-honoured, traditional provision that there shall be notice given of any motion proposed to the House by the government, by the opposition or by a private member, cannot be followed. The only exception to that rule is where the matter is of such urgency that a motion should be proposed, either by the government or by a private member, under the terms of Standing Order 43.

I submit that this Standing Order does not provide members with the opportunity to make allegations, statements of fact or alleged fact, in support of the motion proposed. The only statement that can be made, I suggest, must have reference to the matter of urgency. If we get involved in a situation where every day we have motions which are actually debate, every one of the 263 members in the House could tomorrow move three or four motions of this kind without giving due notice. This certainly would not be in conformity with the traditions of this House.

I am not pointing the finger at the hon. member in particular because he is, perhaps, only doing what we have slowly slipped into doing, namely, the submission of argument when he should really be limiting the brief presentation to the question of urgency which would justify the very exceptional circumstance of an appeal to Standing Order 43.

Mr. Bell: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am just reminding hon. members of the rules. If the hon. member is rising on a point of order, I will hear him.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to repeat what I have said before. The main reason that we move these motions is the disgraceful attendance of ministers under the roster system, and I include the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) the fact that his leader is away today.

Mr. Peters: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.