Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I would like an explanation. This is a fairly simple section. It reads as follows:

Section 15 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Normally when you are making an amendment to a bill and have it before you, you also have what it amends. In this case, however, we have the following:

15. (1) The minister may order (a) that the specific rate of duty provided for in tariff items 8702-2, 8703-1, 8704-1, 8706-1, 8707-1, 8709-1, 8710-1, 8715-1, 8717-1, 8720-1, 8721-1, 8722-1, 8724-2, 8728-1, 9201-1, 9202-1, 9203-2, 9205-2, 9206-2, 9208-1, 9210-1, 9211-2.

It is continued on the next page where it reads:

—and 9402-1 shall apply in lieu of the *ad valorem* rate of duty or the free rate of duty.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked to pass that. What in hell does it mean? What is the point of putting it in there in that form? There is no explanation of what it modifies, and no explanation of any of the figures. Why did they not just put in the numbers from 8702-2 to 9201-1 inclusive? Why did they leave some out? Why is it not a full series of numbers. Now we are going to pass it. Why? What does it say? What does it tell me? What does it tell you? We can go on, as there is a whole lot more.

If anyone here thinks they understand it, I will read it for them, but I do not see any sense in reading it. It does not make any sense to me and I do not think it is going to make sense to anybody else. There is nothing to put it against, as the former minister of agriculture pointed out. How are we going to make a tariff change by a number that does not apply to anything, is not related to anything, does not modify anything, and when there is no indication of what product is affected? Can we guess? The hon. lady who spoke a minute ago mentioned cheese. Is that 8704-1 or 8722-1 or could it be 9211-2?

During the war this kind of code was used to confuse the enemy; here it is used to confuse hon. members. There is no bloody way we should pass this kind of junk, and that is all it is. I do not think I ever remember not having something to put it against. If we are going to modify something we should say what we are modifying. The act is not mentioned nor is the section that is to be modified. The page supplied for notes is blank on what is being modified.

I do not know if this is good or bad, Mr. Chairman. I do not know anything about it—I do not know what any of those numbers are. I am pretty sure not many Canadians know what the numbers are, either. I do not think there is any sense in me saying, "pass Mr. Chairman, pass, Mr. Chairman"—pass for what reason? If we wanted to give this government a blank cheque we would do so, but we do not need to do it in this form.

We got a little lecture on freedom of information tonight—and I agree entirely with it—but Mr. Chairman, this is not freedom of information or freedom of anything else. The explanatory note comprises three lines which read:

This Bill would implement the ways and means motions relating to the *Customs Tariff* that were tabled by the Minister of Finance on October 23, 1979.

I lost the ways and means. I asked the Table officer to send me a copy, and he did. It is identical to what is here. It does not tell me anything different. What does tell us something? If the parliamentary secretary wants to tell me what these specific rates of duty provided for in tariff item 8702-2 are, and later is going to tell me about 8703-1, then I would also like to know why 8702-1 is not included? Why do we not do something with that one as well? Maybe he wants to tell me that and maybe he does not. I do not know.

We do some very stupid things as members of Parliament, Mr. Chairman. Today I was considering the salary we are paid and I am surprised how highly paid we are for our efficiency. If we were to pass this, it seems to me that we do not deserve any kind of salary. We are being asked to pass something that does not relate to anything and that does not have any yardstick to measure it against—obviously it is modifying something. It reads, "Section 15 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:". The note in the margin reads, "Application of specific duties or *ad valorem* rate in certain items." It does not say what they are nor whether they are additions.

Clause 1, which we passed, referred to: "Strawberries or cherries, pickled or preserved in salt, brine, oil or any other manner,". That covers a wide variety of things.

Mr. Froese: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. The schedules are attached to the bill and the numbers are there. I realize they are not the same as they were in former years. I cannot understand the hon. member, with all his years of experience in the House, not knowing what the numbers were in previous years. I personally have looked up the areas that are important to me and I know where the changes have taken place. When it comes to fruit and vegetables, I know what the numbers are. I feel the schedule shows the changes that are going to be made, and there must be a record in Parliament of what they were before.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I am duly chastised, humbled, and highly sorry that I cannot understand it. We are not on the appendix, are we? Maybe I missed something—maybe we have reached the stage of the appendix, or maybe we are going to discuss the appendix separately item by item. If we are at that stage, then I missed something. I was of the opinion that we were on clause 2. If I am, it does not list the appendix in this section. When we come to the appendix I presume we will discuss that. I am pleased that the member is familiar with the tariff numbers and that he understands. I would guesstimate that there are 250,000 tariff numbers. Maybe that is a conservative figure. In 20 years I have not given much attention to memorizing that list. It is not the Canadian Tire catalogue, and I am not going to get a prize.

● (2150)

I am still of the opinion that we have listed these numbers but have not indicated what they are put against or to what they apply. Maybe I should ask a very simple question. Why