

adjournment: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—External Affairs—transmission to United States Secretary of State of third report of environmental pollution committee and concurrence of House; the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)—Agriculture—prairie provinces—action to improve net farm income.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

#### INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray (for Mr. Benson) that Bill C-259, to amend the Income Tax Act and to make certain provisions and alterations in the statute law related to or consequential upon the amendments to that act, be read the second time and referred to a committee of the whole.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. When the House rose earlier today, hon. members were debating the procedural acceptability of an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). We heard from a number of learned colleagues. I remember well the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) had the floor, and still has the floor for the purpose of enlightening the Chair.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Your Honour has just pointed out, when we rose at six o'clock we were discussing the procedural aspects of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I had occupied the time of the House for a few minutes, indicating not only my support for the procedural admissibility of this amendment, split infinitive and all, but also my belief that the House as a whole should take a new look at the whole question of reasoned amendments.

I had begun to point out—and I was going to quote a bit more from May's seventeenth edition—that one of the arguments that is sometimes made from the other side is that if a reasoned amendment is allowed, the House can find itself discussing a proposition which differs from the proposition put before the House by the government. I see nothing wrong with that; in fact, I think there is everything to be said for it. I believe we have to stay within the rules of relevancy: if the government brings down a bill having to do with elephants, we must not try to switch to a discussion about kangaroos. However, when the government brings in a bill having to do with so-called tax reform, surely we have the right to alter that discussion so long as we stay within the general ambit of tax reform. Therefore, I suggest the argument that a reasoned amendment produces a slight turn in the debate on the floor of the House is not a valid one.

#### Income Tax Act

It is also sometimes argued from the other side that if a reasoned amendment were to carry, certain dire consequences such as the defeat of the government would follow. On this side of the House we do not regard that as a dire consequence; we regard it as something devoutly to be desired.

**Mr. Fairweather:** A merciful delivery.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I should like to remind the House there have been, certainly in the United Kingdom Parliament, a number of occasions when some pretty far reaching consequences have been the result of reasoned amendments. As I pointed out just before six o'clock, there is a section in May's seventeenth edition, beginning at page 528, which carries the heading, "Effect of carrying a Reasoned Amendment". I do not think the first paragraph is quite so important because it deals with amendments which try to achieve additions to the bill which could be put in the bill in committee, and it tends to frown on that kind of amendment; it states that that kind is really not a reasoned amendment. However, there are examples of even that kind of amendment having been allowed. It is the second paragraph to which I refer and which I should like to read:

It must be borne in mind, however, that the amendment—

This is a reasoned amendment.

—if agreed to, does not necessarily arrest the progress of the bill, the second reading of which may be moved on another occasion. The technical effect of such an amendment is to supersede the question for now reading the bill a second time; and the bill is left in the same position as if the question for now reading the bill a second time had been simply negated or superseded by the previous question. The House refuses on that particular day to read the bill a second time, and gives its reasons for such refusal; but the bill is not otherwise disposed of.

That is precisely what we have in the amendment which is before us. It is a statement that this House does not want to give second reading to this bill, together with the reasons for asking the House not to do so.

● (8:10 p.m.)

I emphasize the fact that these paragraphs in May's seventeenth edition carry with them the implication that because a reasoned amendment can result in something that is not planned by the government is no reason for not allowing such a reasoned amendment.

Then let me draw attention to some of the examples that are on these pages. Granted, some of these go back in history a bit.

**Mr. Benjamin:** How far?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The first was 110 years ago. This is recent history. It reads:

In 1861, the second reading of the marriage law amendment bill having been superseded by a resolution, the Speaker, on an appeal from the mover of the bill, suggested that the best course would be to withdraw the bill and introduce another in harmony with the expressed opinion of the House.

There is a footnote to tell us where that can be found. But the point of reading it is to tell the House that here was an occasion when a reasoned amendment was