

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton), seconded by Mr. MacLean (Queens), moved,—That the said amendments be now read a second time and concurred in; but that this house, while disapproving of any infringement of its privileges or rights by the other house, in this case waives its claims to insist upon such rights and privileges, but the waiver of said rights and privileges is not to be drawn into a precedent.

And that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

That was on July 14, last Tuesday. Naturally, I assumed, as did all other honourable senators, that the amendments would be approved by the other place, but that it would assert its right to certain privileges, and so forth.

I think it was five minutes before eleven o'clock this evening, the 18th day of July, when the Senate received the message acquainting it that the House of Commons was not accepting one amendment, for reasons which were not referred to in any way in the report in the *Votes and Proceedings* of that house of July 14.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: Indirectly.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: My honourable friend says "indirectly". I say there is no reference to them whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: Do you have to put the reasons in?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Yes, you have to put the reasons in. I do not suppose they would be so impolite as to say: "We do not accept them, and that is the end of it." Certainly, they put the reasons in, and the reasons were read by His Honour the Speaker.

The Hon. the Speaker: Three reasons were read.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Yes, and I shall refer to those reasons in a minute. My point is that here, in the very last hour of the last day of the session, we receive word from the House of Commons saying, in effect, although we have had your amendments before us for almost a month, we decide now at the very last minute we are not going to accept one them, and that is the end of it. Of course, that is the end of it. We know it is the end of it. If we insist on our amendment there is no Income Tax Bill—that is the end of the legislation.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): It is an end to the increase in taxes.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Yes, it is an end to the increases in taxes which the Government is putting into effect. I am sure we would not take the responsibility upon our-

selves of throwing out the income tax amendments, as much as many of us object to them. So we are left with this situation, and we have to accept the decision of the other place.

I would point out, honourable senators, that the refusal to accept this amendment made to the bill comes to this house when the honourable senators who sponsored the amendment, or most of them, are not here to speak to it.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: They should be here.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: The Government may have known they were not here.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: I think that is an unfair statement.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: It may be unfair. If it is, I withdraw it. In any event, it is not nearly as unfair as asking us to meet the refusal of this amendment in the dying moments of this session of Parliament. I simply say that those honourable senators are not here and cannot answer the objections raised.

I would point out that not all honourable senators who supported this amendment sit on this side of the house.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Many, if not most, of those who were keenly interested in the passage of this amendment are supporters of the Government rather than of the Opposition. I say that in order that the Government and the people will know that this is not primarily an Opposition amendment.

It presents two problems: first, the sponsors of the amendment are not here to answer the objections; and secondly, if the Senate does not accept the refusal of this amendment by the other place, the whole Income Tax Bill is defeated.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Why, may I ask, do you say the whole bill is defeated?

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Because we cannot pass half a bill. We pass the bill as amended, or we do not pass it at all. If we do not accept the refusal of the amendment by the other place, the bill in that respect goes back to its original form, and all the amendments to the Income Tax Bill are thrown out.

Hon. Mr. Brunt: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: It means that we throw out Bill C-48, not the whole act.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I think I said it means that we throw out the whole Income Tax Bill.