

authorizing the government to borrow a certain sum has always included a note or a clause dealing with income tax making it necessary to deal with it in Committee of the Whole and consequently this practice is not something new since it has existed for well over 25 years and there is no more substance in this argument than in the others. Mr. Speaker Lamoureux' quotation is taken from the *House of Commons Debates* of May 11, 1977, on page 5,522. It is interesting to note that the bill about which a point of order was raised was an omnibus bill entitled:

● (1530)

[English]

Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Customs Tariff, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

It was asked at that time that the bill be divided because it was an omnibus bill. Here is what Speaker Jerome said about that bill, referring to Speaker Lamoureux. The Speaker noted that "the same situation has arisen several times in the past with all the same arguments having been made". He referred to two rulings by his predecessor, the Hon. Lucien Lamoureux, one on January 26, 1971, having to do with the government reorganization bill, and the second on January 23, 1969, which dealt again with an omnibus bill relating to the Criminal Code. These rulings were discussed earlier; I mentioned them.

Referring to the decision of former Speaker Lamoureux, Mr. Jerome stated:

His decision is crystal clear, and there can be no doubt that a motion containing two or more substantive provisions is quite distinct from a procedural motion or a motion which is generally described as having only the effect of dealing with the progress of a bill. The practice in respect of substantive motions has never been extended to those motions which relate to the progress of a bill. The use of the omnibus amending bill is well enshrined in our practices, and I really can find no reason to set aside my predecessor's very clear and sound reasoning, or the practice. Nor can I find any authority which would support an order of the Chair at this second reading stage that the bill be divided.

I should emphasize as well that the remedy sought by the hon. member is not to divide the bill according to the separate statutes to be amended but by subject matter.

He then goes into the specifics of the matter raised at that time. I think, Madam Speaker, that you had those precedents and that parliamentary practice in mind the last time you had to rule on a bill which this government attempted to introduce in the House of Commons, which included borrowing authority for the government plus certain taxation bills and which you did not accept at that time for procedural reasons. At the time you said that the government ought to have given a different notice for the borrowing authority aspect of the bill. I remember that very well. We had to divide the bill for the specific reason of default of notice.

● (1540)

I am sure once again, Madam Speaker, that you had all the practice clearly in mind when you stated in *Hansard* on January 19, 1981, as reported at page 6319:

I should make clear to members that I have no quarrel with the practice of combining in the same bill taxation matters based on Ways and Means motions with other matters, provided that the provisions of Standing Order 42(1) are

fulfilled and notice properly given. Precedents to that effect can be found at page 42—

End of quotation.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, when you stated that at this same time last year you had no misgiving and that you wanted it to be quite clear to members on both sides of the House that you saw no difficulty whatsoever in authorizing the introduction of income tax measures within a bill dealing with any other matter, hence within a bill providing authority to borrow certain sums, in my opinion, there is no doubt that you were quite aware of that parliamentary practice and I entirely agree with you for the sake of consistency and coherence in rulings as well as in the development of parliamentary practice, and I feel that it would be quite strange, not to say shocking, that we should break away from that well-established practice. It would be inconsistent with any rule, practice and precedent. Once again, I listened closely to what the hon. member for Yukon was saying, but there were no new facts, no new arguments concerning similar points of order raised in the past which would allow you to depart from a principle which you explicitly stated on January 19, 1981, and consequently from such a compelling and obvious parliamentary practice.

I am not sure, but I think at one point I heard the hon. member for Yukon refer to the parliamentary practice in use in the United Kingdom. If he did not refer to it, I will. The practice followed in the United Kingdom is very likely to support what we are doing here, because over there only one bill combining all budget measures is introduced, and it is a time-honoured tradition which is also supportive of what we are doing, if my hon. colleague wants to base his argument on the practice in Westminster. In conclusion, Madam Speaker, the legal aspect of the matter having been discussed, debated and presented in a way which I feel is quite clear, based on precedents, and the facts mentioned by the hon. member being quite simple, I should like to add this in support of my views: there is a justification for this practice which the government does not abuse, although it could, and therefore it is not contrary to our own Standing Orders and parliamentary practice. The fact is that we are now in 1982 and the number of bills is increasing day after day, week after week, month after month, and I suggest that when we can reasonably combine a number of measures deriving from the same principle, dealing with the same issue, in doing so we are not in any way limiting the freedom of expression of hon. members, because this bill, I repeat, will go through all three stages: second reading where the principle of the bill will be examined; then, clause by clause consideration of the bill in committee, as provided under our Standing Orders, where all hon. members will be able to express their views; and, finally, third reading, where an amendment may be moved for a further reference of the subject matter of the bill to the committee. Those are so many