### Order Paper Questions

## Mr. Peter Stollery (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State and Minister of Communications):

I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

#### 1. Yes.

- (a) Executive producer, TV Current Affairs.
- (b) Mark Starowicz is involved with the development of the new program which will follow "The National" after its move to 10 p.m. in September, 1981. He is not connected with newscasts.
- (c) Not applicable.
- 2. It has not been customary to require the CBC to provide such details of its internal management and administration as those referred to in the question. The background to this custom is explained in the answer to question No. 2,530, November 6, 1975.

#### CBC—PARLIAMENTARY LIAISON OFFICER

### Question No. 2,306-Mr. Cossitt:

- 1. Does the CBC maintain a parliamentary liaison officer in Ottawa and, if so, what is the (a) person's name (b) annual salary and all costs involved with maintaining this officer?
- 2. With reference to the answers to various Order Paper questions concerning the CBC which include the phrase "It has not been customary to require the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to provide such details of its internal management and administration . . .", for what reason does the CBC maintain a parliamentary liaison officer if it is not prepared to make full disclosure of its operations to Parliament?

# Mr. Peter Stollery (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State and Minister of Communications):

I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

- (a) The CBC maintains a parliamentary services section whose members co-ordinate the CBC's day-to-day relationship with Parliament.
  - (b) With regard to salaries and costs, see the reply to parts (a) and (b) of question No. 2,530, November 6, 1975.
- 2. The CBC does disclose information about its operations, with the exception of certain categories of information relating to its internal management and administration. See the reply to parts (a) and (b) of question No. 2,530, November 6, 1975.
- Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### EXCISE TAX ACT AND EXCISE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Yvon Pinard (for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-57, to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act and to provide for a revenue tax in respect of petroleum and gas, be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Knowles: Is there no minister to speak on this bill?

Mr. Collenette: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There was an arrangement whereby the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) would be the lead speaker followed by someone from the New Democratic Party, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Evans) would be here this afternoon to respond on behalf of the government.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): That is right.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Madam Speaker, I wish to confirm what has been told to us by the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader. The minister has excused himself. He is unavoidably absent today because he is on other business. The parliamentary secretary will be responding for the government at this stage.

We are at the last stage of a very infamous and, I would say, contemptuous move by this government regarding this particular bill. On the initial debate we had about half a day on a Friday so that the bill could get into committee, with the understanding that there would be witnesses and a full examination, but there was a deadline. More witnesses appeared than had been forecast.

The net result was that the committee had very little negotiating and discussing of the proposed amendments, as we did with respect to many other important bills. The deadline resulted in almost a guillotine falling on the amendments to the clauses as they were considered in the committee. I am not faulting the chairman of the committee in any way. It was just a matter of logistics. There was no time to put or consider any amendments in the committee. There was no time for negotiating any amendments or developing negotiating positions with regard to some very contentious matters contained in this bill.

• (1210)

The net result is that the government shut its eyes to almost all questions of amendment except with regard to a ceiling on advertising in newspapers and inserts. However, that was a minor point, albeit very important to the weekly newspapers. There was very little else of any consequence. It dealt a little with distributors of cosmetic products, shifted the incidence of the excise tax, but for the rest of it the government's reaction has been entirely negative. Therefore, by mutual consent it would almost appear, the New Democratic Party and ourselves