

as to any of the circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill.

So we are left with the first category, that is to say, that the amendment may be declaratory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill. There really is nothing in the amendment presented by the hon. member for Edmonton West that does that, because there is no position taken adversely to the principle of the bill. Irrelevant and additional matters are brought in. The amendment reads:

This House deeply concerned with unacceptable levels of inflation—

That is matter foreign to the bill.

—persisting unemployment and stagnant industry and conscious of the necessity of meaningful tax reform declines to give second reading to a bill which does not provide sufficient stimulus to the economy of Canada with appropriate tax cuts and incentives, does not contain adequate tax exemptions and is not calculated to materially improve business and labour conditions in Canada now or in the foreseeable future.

If you take the amendment, Mr. Speaker, in its terms there is nothing attacking the principle of equity or reform contained in the bill, but only matters foreign to the bill. The use of a tax bill as a vehicle in the economy or as a fiscal weapon, admittedly within the terms of this amendment, are alluded to, and so there are references in the amendment to inflation, to labour and management, to economic stimulus. But on the face of the bill and within the terms of the bill I submit to Your Honour that there is nothing in the amendment stating a principle adverse to the principle of the bill.

After setting forth those three categories, May goes on to say—and I submit to Your Honour that the amendment does not fall within those categories:

The following rules govern the contents of reasoned amendments:—

The first is the one Beaudesne was referring to in the citation that I gave to Your Honour, 203(1). Here is what May says at the bottom of page 527 of his seventeenth edition:

The principle of relevancy in an amendment...governs every such motion. The amendment must "strictly relate to the bill which the House, by its order, has resolved upon considering", and must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration by the House.

These words have been approved by the Chair on several occasions in this Parliament, and I refer Your Honour to a very recent decision of the Deputy Speaker, in fact made last week, relating to Bill C-262. I quote from *Votes and Proceedings* of September 7, 1971, at page 779 as follows:

Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), proposed to move in amendment thereto.—That Bill C-262 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should give consideration to the introduction of measures to stimulate the Canadian economy and to free it from its dependence on that of the United States, to obtain additional markets for Canada's exports, and to protect Canadian jobs from the consequences of the policies announced by the President of the United States.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Hear, hear!

Income Tax Act

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am not going to argue the substance of that amendment. I am trying to argue the relevancy of that amendment and I want to draw to the attention of Your Honour the similarity between the amendment introduced by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), seconded by the perennial hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and the present amendment proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I use the word "perennial" with respect to the hon. member's membership in this House and also with respect to his support for this type of amendment which, I suggest to Your Honour, does not usually receive the approbation of the Chair.

I draw Your Honour's attention to the references in both amendments to stimulation of the economy. I agree that this is a very laudable objective, but it is foreign to the substance of this particular bill. What did the Deputy Speaker say on that occasion? He said:

—an amendment must clearly oppose the principle of a bill.

The Deputy Speaker referred to May and went on to say, as recorded at page 779:

The second point I should like to make is that an amendment must stay within the four corners of a bill. On the question of relevancy it does seem to me that this amendment goes beyond the four corners of the bill.

I could go on with these precedents, but my first submission to Your Honour is that this amendment as reasoned amendment does not qualify within the essential categories May specifies as a reasoned amendment. I bring in May because the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did so, but more particularly because even if it were a reasoned amendment, which I submit it is not, it does not qualify because it is irrelevant.

There are two other citations from Beaudesne that I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention. Going to citation 203, I submit that paragraph 3 is relevant. It reads:

An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

I submit to Your Honour that if you read "bill" for "motion," then the principle of foreign and irrelevant matter again would go to exclude the amendment.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Are "sufficient stimulus" and "tax cuts" also foreign?

An hon. Member: You are getting to him.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes, I may be reaching the hon. member for Edmonton West. In the third place, may I draw Your Honour's attention to citation 203(5):

An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

I submit that the matter raised in this amendment dealing with inflation, unemployment, industry, stimulus of the economy, incentives, methods calculated to materially improve business and labour conditions in Canada, are sufficiently wide and sufficiently foreign to the bill before the House that they would deserve to be included