

of the confusion which has resulted from the various points of view that have been taken by different Ministers of the Government, I request the Speaker of this House to indicate that an emergency debate will be allowed to take place on the whole concept and issue of universality later this day.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Sudbury (Mr. Frith) is asking leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 30 to discuss a matter which is significantly similar to the one cited yesterday in the application made by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner).

I have once again given considerable thought to the underlying principles that must guide the Speaker in deciding whether an application under this Standing Order ought to be accepted. Inevitably, the Chair is called upon to make a value judgment as to whether or not a given situation is an emergency. In the opinion of the Hon. Member it is urgent to him that the question of universality of social programs be considered, and I presume from the voices being raised in the House it is urgent to other Members as well.

In my opinion, very little has changed since yesterday in the circumstances surrounding this subject. While the matter may be immediately relevant, of concern and on the minds of many Hon. Members, the Hon. Member for Sudbury has not convinced me that a genuine emergency exists yet.

That is not to say, however, that the circumstances in this matter of continuing debate and concern could not change, and that, faced with unexpected occurrences leading to a real emergency, I might not rule otherwise. Therefore, I must refuse the Hon. Member's application.

\* \* \*

#### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Paul Dick (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Government House Leader)):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall all the notices of motions stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of State (Government House Leader)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House of the business which is scheduled for this afternoon. There has been no indication prior to this with respect to the business for today.

First, the House will deal with the excise tax Bill. That will be followed by the borrowing Bill. When the House is finished with those two items, it will proceed to the completion of the Bill which deals with Investment Canada.

#### *Excise Tax Act*

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

#### EXCISE TAX ACT EXCISE ACT

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, December 18, consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall that Bill C-17, an Act to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Nipigon (Mr. Epp).

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the Hon. Member already spoken in this debate?

**Mr. Epp (Thunder Bay-Nipigon):** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry, I am being confused by the angels! The Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker).

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which is in relation to the calling of second reading of this Bill. Until this morning, I did not have a chance to look at the ruling of the Chair which was made yesterday in relation to the calling of this order.

As Mr. Speaker will recall, it was agreed in this Chamber to make Bill C-12 Bill C-17. That was done after Bill C-12 had been called, read the first time, read a second time and debate was to have been on second reading. A motion was then presented to the Chair that, in effect, indicated that this Bill was deemed to have been read a first time and deemed to have been introduced for second reading by the Minister.

There are certain things which this Chamber can do, but there are certain things which it cannot do. Therefore, I submit that this Chamber cannot deem a Bill to have been read a first and second time without that Bill having been read a first and second time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then the Hon. Member should have raised that point yesterday. The House chose yesterday to achieve this by unanimous consent. It was a request which was put to the House for unanimous consideration. It was adopted unanimously. Had the Hon. Member not been in favour of that proceeding, and had he been here yesterday, his rights as a Member would have been protected at that time. However, the Member cannot now raise a point of order arguing that the House could not do what the House chose to do yesterday. It was the choice of the House.

Does the Hon. Member have something to add?

**Mr. Baker:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the rules state "when it comes to a Member's attention". I was not here yesterday, but surely I have the right to raise a point of order—