

with their own hands and raised the money to buy their own fire truck, be recognized. All the motion asks is that when a voluntary fireman is out fighting a fire, receiving not a penny, Mr. Speaker, nothing but thanks from those he helps, if he is to do damage to his own person or his own clothing, he can receive a tax break in replacing those things damaged during the course of a fire. That is all this motion asks. Surely to God it is not too much to expect that in Private Members' hour in this House, which in the final analysis decides the law, all Parties can agree to having a vote.

I can spend a lot more time speaking on this Bill, but I will not do so because I do not want to be accused of being one of those who, for silly, bureaucratic, old, archaic, institutionalized, nonsensical reasons, talks this Bill out. Let us get on with it.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague from Nova Scotia, the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) in supporting this particular motion which was laid before the Chamber. Like the previous speaker, I believe this particular motion is a tax policy issue. In looking at the tax policies, some people would perhaps question whether or not we should use the income tax system to provide such benefits to volunteer firemen. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of Section 6(1)(b) and Section 8 of the Income Tax Act ought to be looked at quite seriously.

We ought to concede to the request made by the Hon. Member for South West Nova. As a result, I want to lend my support, Mr. Speaker, to this particular motion and say, yes, it is an exceptional benefit being proposed for firemen, but firemen, Mr. Speaker, across this country, particularly volunteer firemen, provide a great service to the Canadian people. I wish to join with others on this side of the House who support not only the pith and substance of the motion, but, indeed, the effects it will have on the people it is supposed to serve, namely, the volunteer firemen of Canada.

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) for introducing this motion. As the House has heard, it is supported by the Conservative Party, the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm), myself, and the Hon. Member for Dauphin-Swan River (Mr. Lewycky). There will be only two speakers, as I understand, from the Conservative Party in support of this Bill because we all know the Liberals are trying to talk it out. There have been three Liberal speakers already. We will be very interested to see how many more Liberal speakers there will be before the clock runs out at six o'clock. If Hon. Members opposite have the interest of the volunteer firemen at heart, they will let this motion pass and go to committee. It has been talked out before. We heard all about it from the Hon. Member for Peterborough.

I support the volunteer firemen, not just in the riding of Victoria-Haliburton, but right across the country. I believe that if we prevented this motion from being referred to committee tonight—and I am sure if that happens it will be

Volunteer Firemen

because of the Liberal Party—we will be doing a great disservice to the smaller communities which are scattered throughout this large country of ours. I suggest that the Members opposite think about this. They have had three speakers until now. We are cutting it off at two speakers. With these remarks, and to keep it short, I will sit down. I certainly hope this Bill will get into committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before recognizing another Hon. Member, the Chair would like to draw to the attention of all Hon. Members *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, Citation 435. I raise this matter advisedly, having listened attentively, as I always do, to comments of Hon. Members from all sides of the House. I quote Citation 435(1):

It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee.

I leave that to the reflection of Hon. Members, having taken good note of the comments made in their speeches. The matter before the House can be disposed of in two ways: by accepting the motion or by rejecting the motion outright or, if it is the intention of Hon. Members to do so, by sending this motion—to a committee of the House to have it redrafted, because in its present form the Chair could not accept a motion to the effect that the subject matter of the motion be referred to the committee. I leave that to the reflection of Hon. Members for the time being.

Mr. Domm: Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the Chair and all Parties in the House, I would like to submit to the Chair a motion that the contents of the recommended—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is not in order for the Hon. Member on a point of order to make a motion or recommendation at this time because he has already spoken, unless, of course, he were given unanimous consent to do so.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent. We will now proceed with debate.

Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The point raised by yourself, Mr. Speaker, was the very point I was going to mention. I was also going to point out that the motion we are debating here reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act—

The fastest way in which this change could be brought into effect would be if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) would consider this as a change to be brought in in his Budget, and I presume there will be a Budget fairly soon in the fall. That is the fastest way in which it could be accomplished.

I have just one or two points to make, Mr. Speaker, having to do with the importance of this particular resolution brought forward by the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell).