

Health and Welfare. In view of the imminence of the new immigration policy I should like to ask the minister of health whether there is any new manpower data on applications made by medical students to universities in Canada, first of all indicating their willingness to do general practice for a stated period, and secondly indicating their willingness to go where there is need for medical manpower in Canada?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, if I understand well the question of the hon. member, he is referring to medical students?

**Mr. Rynard:** That is right.

**Mr. Lalonde:** I do not have such data at the present time but I will inquire of my department and see whether such data are available. I do not think any exists but I will check with the provinces and find out whether they have such information.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-49, to amend the Statute law relating to income tax, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) (p. 2914).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. During yesterday's proceedings on this measure the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) put forward an amendment. The Chair having quite appropriately reserved its decision on the procedural acceptability of a second reading amendment, it was understood in so doing that hon. members would be given an opportunity to discuss the matter and to make representations at this time before the Chair made a final ruling. The hon. member for Edmonton West.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and I shall be as commendably brief as possible on this point of order. Reasoned amendments in the past, if one wants to look at the record of *Hansard*, have been relatively rare, and quite so because, I put it to Your Honour, our rules were different then. It was in 1969, when there was a change in the rules of the House, that it started to become more important for the House to be able to put reasoned amendments. This is why I insist that the House must have the opportunity of putting reasoned amendments.

• (1550)

Hitherto on bills of this kind there was a resolution that was debated in the House; it was subject to amendment

### Income Tax

and debate. But the bill we are discussing today, Bill C-49, came directly from the adoption of the budget resolutions, the minister having tabled the notice of ways and means and obtained permission for first reading of the bill based upon the ways and means motion on income tax, without debate and without a vote. There must be a joinder of issue. I refer Your Honour to the arguments I made in September of 1971 when I proposed a similar type of motion on a similar occasion on an income tax bill. I refer Your Honour to page 7763 of *Hansard* of September 13, 1971, from which I will read in a moment.

First of all I will say what I said before. Beauchesne is of little or no use. As a matter of fact, it is a hindrance to us at this time. On second reading there may be an amendment for a six months' hoist: that is perfectly proper. There may be reference of the subject matter of the bill to a committee. However, the motion before us calls for reference of this particular bill to committee of the whole. But the House must be in a position to express an opinion with regard to this bill, and merely to say that it shall be read six months hence or that there should be a vote, yes or no, on the total bill is wrong.

Am I allowed to bring Bill C-49 as a visual exhibit into the House? It is part of the property of the House. It is one inch thick: It covers the Income Tax Act, and there is no more complicated legislation. It goes from soup to nuts, literally: it covers the whole menu. There is no way in which hon. members can properly express themselves by a yes or no vote on this total bill. There are many features in it. It is an omnibus bill. I suppose the minister could bring in four bills, those which are purely of a housekeeping nature arising out of amendments made in 1971, those which deal with personal income tax, those which deal with corporate income tax, and those dealing with natural resources, royalties and the industries concerned.

This bill could be broken up into four bills and the House could possibly arrive at a clearcut opinion with regard to each of those bills. But I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to consider the conditions under which the House is operating today—not in Beauchesne's day. You will note the comments I have made with regard to Beauchesne. My grandfather was not alive at the time of these precedents.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** This is an unusual argument, that if Beauchesne is not with you it does not apply.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Beauchesne is so out of date that it is a dangerous book. I said so when I occupied the chair that Your Honour now occupies. It is even more dangerous today because of the remarkable changes in rules that have occurred since 1963. Now I should like to read a quotation from *Hansard* of September 13, 1971, to which I referred a moment ago. This is what I said:

This bill had its origin in a resolution passed before this House without debate or amendment. The provision of rule 60 is such that the minister is empowered to bring forward a bill. That is the motion; it is not the budgetary proposal that antedated it. The motion starts with the ways and means resolutions which were not the subject of debate. This, then, is the first opportunity for debate.

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that in order to have debate there must be a joinder of issue; there must be an alternative to the principle . . . We declined to read the bill and from a procedural