

Income Tax Act

● (1532)

Mr. Blais: There is no mandatory provision requiring that a full two hours be taken up in debate on the limitation motion. I suggest that if the hon. gentleman is anxious to have his point of order argued, he might consent to having a vote taken now, followed by a debate on the merits of his point of order.

Mr. Stevens: With reference to my point of order, as I indicated, I felt we had the unanimous consent of the committee of the whole on Thursday to have the matter considered at the earliest opportunity by yourself, Mr. Speaker. I was simply trying to expedite the procedure. It might be helpful if we could have a ruling with respect to when the three sitting days will commence, in that if it is clear that there will be extra time tonight after whatever length of debate takes place on the closure motion, it would facilitate an argument being made with respect to my point of order later tonight.

Mr. Chrétien: If the hon. member is willing to consider today as the first day of the time allocation, I would have absolutely no objection. I do not want to debate that matter once more. The points were made. I tried to give explanations. There are some differences between the ways and means motion and the provisions in the act, and I tried to explain them in the best way I could. Now I leave the matter for the Chair to decide.

I do not want to argue with the hon. member once more. It is up to the Chairman of the committee to make a decision, or to refer it to you, Mr. Speaker. I am completely agreeable. If we were to vote on this motion right away and proceed today with the clause by clause study in committee of the whole, and consider today as the first day, I think everyone would be happy.

Mr. Speaker: It would be most helpful, under any circumstances, if we moved quickly to resume committee of the whole proceedings. If the Chairman does report to me any decision he has made, then I can take action on it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, it is germane to the matters under discussion by the House, but in view of some of the comments made I wonder if the deputy House leader on the government side would indicate the intentions of the government with respect to the business of the House tonight in the event that we complete the debate on rule 75C. Can he tell us what he has in mind with respect to the business tonight and for the next few days, on the assumption that today is not counted as the first day of debate? I know that ministers are very anxious to avoid discussing this matter in the House, but possibly I will get an answer from the deputy government House leader.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the preferable course is to complete the debate in as short a period as possible and move on to the balance of the day as the first day of debate. But in light of the point made by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, we may not arrive at that point, and if that is the case, then obviously the first day will be tomorrow.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: It is not for me to decide on matters that have not yet arisen, but I do not think there is any way without strenuous objections on the basis of some pretty clear precedents, that the House will be able to consider today as the first day under the time allocation order. It might be worth a try. I see indications, however, that it will not be very successful.

Mr. Cafik: I have indicated that if the two-hour debate did not last two hours, that may be a possibility. But I would certainly agree with Mr. Speaker and all hon. members that if we cannot count today as the first day, then obviously the first day will be tomorrow and the last day would be on Friday, with an opposition day intervening.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, surely the picture is clear on that point. We have not yet seen the actual motion the minister will move this afternoon, but on Friday his notice read:

—that I shall move . . . that three additional days be allocated to the study of the said bill in the committee on the whole.

Surely those three additional days cannot start until after the motion has been passed.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: This was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre; but unfortunately the deputy House leader did not understand my question. On the assumption that the first day will not start today, has he any idea what business the government has to present to the House for consideration after we finish this debate, whether it be two minutes or two hours, and whatever time it takes for a vote? What has he in mind for House business? Or is this another demonstration that the government does not know what it is doing?

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for the government to indicate what business will take place, when we do not know whether there will be an opportunity for any business at all beyond what is presently before the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

PRIVILEGE

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE VIS-À-VIS SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO JUDGMENT—JUDGMENT TO BE PRINTED IN HOUSE RECORDS

Mr. Speaker: Earlier in the day it was suggested that the reasons for judgment of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario, to which I referred in making my ruling, be printed as an appendix to *Hansard* and in *Votes and Proceedings*, but there was never a House order to that effect. Does the House agree that it be done?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.