

occasions on which that kind of second reading amendment has been accepted, this paragraph points to occasions on which the very identical amendment to which he has referred has been rejected.

Therefore, I would hold that the notion of a new description of what is the subject matter of a bill and the notion of an independent commission, which would be the subject, I would think, of discussion and perhaps disagreement as to composition, both introduce, in my opinion, a new concept to the bill which did not previously exist.

I will not go on to deal with the other very interesting point raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid), namely, that the establishment of an independent commission might indeed call for additional financing—and I can hardly think of anyone who would be more sensitive to that problem than the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who I am sure would conclude, on the basis of that very possibility, that the recommendation contained in the bill would have to be altered for that very purpose alone.

● (2200)

**Mr. Peters:** That is debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Order!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Therefore, for at least three reasons—

**Mr. Peters:** Ten o'clock.

**An hon. Member:** Order!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. For at least three reasons—

**Some hon. Members:** Ten o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Therefore, for those reasons I have to hold that the amendment that has been put forward introduces on at least three grounds a totally new proposition, and the amendment offends all the precedents.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder for the edification of the House if the government House leader could indicate the business for tomorrow. Is it the intention of the government to proceed as suggested earlier, with the adjournment motion? If we knew that, members could perhaps indicate their disposition accordingly.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow it would be my plan to call the adjournment motion, and to call as business Bill C-9, the report stage, and then with unanimous consent we could deal with Bill C-38. There are also four bills from the Senate in the name of my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang), which I would like to bring forward for consideration with the hope of getting them through all stages. I think they are non-controversial, and they have been approved by the Senate.

#### Adjournment Debate

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

#### FINANCE—REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF TAX ON PLEASURE BOATS

**Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton):** Madam Speaker, on December 4, I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) if he would reconsider—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. If hon. members wish to carry on conversations, please do so behind the curtains.

**Mr. Scott:** Madam Speaker, on December 4 I asked the Minister of Finance if he would reconsider his budgetary proposal to impose an additional 10 per cent federal sales tax on pleasure boats that use motors of 20-horsepower or over. The minister said he could not give that assurance, but that it would obviously be a topic of conversation before the committee of the whole house.

Since that time the tax has become a topic of conversation and of controversy all across the country. I am sure the minister must be aware of that, because there is not a member of this House who has not had some representations from constituents on this matter, especially from ridings where tourism is a major factor in the local economy, as it is in my own constituency of Victoria-Haliburton.

On the face of it a 10 per cent sales tax does not sound like much, and I feel certain that the Minister of Finance did not have all the information at his disposal on the probable effects of such a tax, otherwise he would have reconsidered even before tabling the budget.

At first glance it would appear that the only people who might be affected by this tax would be those who can afford to buy a large pleasure boat, along with all the necessary equipment such as a motor. The average person might suggest that it is perfectly all right to slap an additional tax on the wealthy boat owner, especially if the object is to cut down on the use of gasoline and other petroleum products.

However, the problem of this tax goes much deeper than the question of taxing the rich, or of saving on fuel consumption. This tax strikes at the very heart of the tourist industry in Canada. I do not have to remind my hon. colleagues in this House of the millions of dollars we spend each year promoting tourism in Canada, or of the hundreds of millions of dollars we get back each year from the great tourist industry. Perhaps I should remind some hon. members, though, that there are some ridings in Canada that depend so much on tourism that it might be called the cornerstone of their local economies.

It might surprise some hon. members to learn that a reduction in such things as boat building in other ridings could have a major impact on employment in their own ridings. This tax cuts right across the marine industry, not just the marina operator in a tourist centre. The boat and