

*Income Tax Act*

Certainly the amendment before the House is clearly and simply just that.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing I find wrong with this amendment is that it contains a split infinitive, which is something up with which I find it difficult to put.

**Mr. Baldwin:** That is a very serious accusation that you make.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It is. I am glad my hon. friend recognizes that. However, despite the error I regard the amendment as being one of substance which we can support, and I should like to join with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in urging Your Honour to give very serious consideration to it.

It seems to me we are getting to the point where reasoned amendments have become more difficult to move than they ever were, though they have always been difficult. I confess that when I take note of the rulings that we have had from the Chair on reasoned amendments in recent times, especially those that have been negated, I have had to agree that those rulings were based on precedents and on reasons and that therefore I could not appeal the rulings even if that right still lay with us.

However, if we are going to keep alive the phrase "reasoned amendment" it must be possible to make some kind of amendment under that heading. I am not floored by the comment just made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome) that this amendment is just a statement of opposition to the bill plus reasons for so being opposed. I think that is a pretty good description of a right that we ought to have.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** And do have.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** In fact, I think that is what a reasoned amendment is supposed to do. We already have the right to say yes or no to a bill. We have the right to propose a hoist, which is really just another way of saying no. We also have the right to seek a reference of the subject matter rather than the bill to a committee, which again does not permit any reference to any reasons or any alternative ideas.

In some of the previous debates that we have had on this question it has been said by those on the other side, or by the Chair, that if certain reasoned amendments were allowed the House would find itself discussing, not what the government has put forward but what the opposition has put forward.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Terrible!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Not if what the opposition has put forward is in the same area. Indeed, if all that the opposition puts forward is a set of reasons for being opposed to the government's measure, it seems to me that we ought to have the right to have that sort of discussion.

I do not want to be regarded as pleading that we open up the whole business, that we get to the point where anything that might be a substantive motion and which normally requires notice can be dragged in under this

[Mr. Jerome.]

heading. But I do confess to some concern lest we are going in the other direction and getting ourselves in the kind of box where we will not be able to make any reasoned amendments at all.

Citation 382 of Beauchesne has been read, and those of us who take part in these little discussions have read it so often that we know it by heart. So instead of picking up Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, today I have decided to pick up May's seventeenth edition. It is a little unfair to my late friend Dr. Beauchesne to do this, because one sees where he got many of the things that he wrote in his book. But in his seventeenth edition May says the same things that are in citation 382 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, namely, that a reasoned amendment can be declaratory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policies or provisions of a bill.

The hon. member for Peace River pointed out that that is what this amendment proposes to do. By the way, Beauchesne does not use the words "reasoned amendment", but May does. At the bottom of page 526 there is a paragraph with the heading "Reasoned Amendment" which goes on to say:

It is also competent for a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move what is known as a "reasoned amendment".

My concern today relates not only to the amendment now before the House, which I should like to see allowed, but as to where we are going in this whole area. There is a lot more on pages 526 and 527 that I could read, but Your Honour has probably read those pages time and time again. However, I should like to draw attention to the material at the bottom of page 528 and the top of page 529 of May's seventeenth edition, the section under the general heading of "Effect of carrying a 'Reasoned Amendment'." That heading in itself carries a very interesting implication; it suggests that there are times when a reasoned amendment, even though it takes the House away from what the government wants to discuss, might be carried.

• (6:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker,** I should like another four or five minutes. Does the House want me to continue now, or at eight o'clock?

**An hon. Member:** Eight o'clock.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** All right; let me call it six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it understood that we will rise at this point and pursue the argument at eight o'clock?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We can resume the discussion then.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 40, the following matters will be discussed this evening at the time of