

*Business of the House*

interest, if ever any member of this House was. I do not know which one to attend. I would like to go to all three.

I consider this sort of arranging of committees an affront to this House. It is wrong and should not be allowed to occur. The blocking system which was intended to avoid this has broken down. I appeal to Your Honour and, through you, to the government House leader to ensure that in future committees of this importance do not meet at the same time, but that they be spread out in an equitable fashion throughout the week so that those members who have the interest of their constituents and the work of this parliament at heart may attend to their business here.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Translation]

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

My point of order will be brief. I want to say that the contract awarded to the Bombardier firm is for \$1.5 million rather than \$250 million as stated a while ago.

[English]

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order in relation to a bill that was introduced this afternoon by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. In his explanation on the introduction of this bill, he indicated that a bill in his name had been passed, sent to the other place and will receive Royal Assent today.

My point of order is in relation to the second bill which the parliamentary secretary introduced. He indicated it was consequential on the passage of the first bill. I suggest it would be a bad practice to allow the passing of a bill prepared by a private member which would, in fact, change other laws in order to make workable the law which we have already passed. This is a government responsibility. If a bill is passed amending the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, that is the responsibility of the government. The government should bring in the consequential amendment rather than the hon. member.

The reason I am concerned is that if this were allowed, it could do two things. The government could have two forms of legislation, one which they provide to their back-bench members to bring forward with their agreement and the other legislation from their normal sources. That would not be in keeping with the use of private members legislation. The second difficulty is if a member has the good fortune to have a private members bill accepted, whether or not that bill had any effect, even though it had received three readings in this House, three readings in the other place and Royal Assent, it would not become operative if there were consequential amendments the government was not willing to put into effect.

I ask Your Honour to look at this because it appears to be a totally different kind of bill from what we normally have from private members. The practice in the past has been that once Royal Assent is given to a bill, it becomes law and the government is responsible for consequential amendments. It would be bad practice if, to carry out the will of this House, it were necessary for a private member to go through that procedure to make the amendments.

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

The responsibility to make it operative should be on the shoulders of the government.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has raised a very interesting point in connection with the bill of the Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council. However, the practices of the House have been such that introduction of a bill pretty much follows as a matter of course. I am sure the hon. member's remarks will be repeated when the hon. member's bill comes up for consideration. In the meantime, he has raised a very worthwhile point that I will be pleased to consider very carefully.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## INCOME TAX ACT

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-49, to amend the statute law relating to income tax, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Thanks to the efforts of parliamentary counsel we found a printing error in the bill. I draw the attention of the House to page 269 of the bill as reprinted. In the French version, section 118(1) has been eliminated. I think it should be replaced and the rest of the page re-annotated. Perhaps the House would allow that to be done.

● (1530)

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Stevens:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I presumed the Minister of Finance would at least give us the benefit of some remarks at this stage. During the proceedings in committee of the whole many questions were put to the minister which he declined to answer, and many amendments were suggested which he turned down. We are now asked to amend the bill once again, following an error. I had assumed the minister would be speaking on third reading.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, this bill had been before us now for four weeks. I was here virtually all the time and responded as best I could to all the questions put to me. I have nothing further to add at this stage.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, on this motion to give third reading to Bill C-49, dealing with income tax provisions, I propose to move an amendment which would have the effect of requiring that the bill be not now read the third time but that it be sent back to committee of the whole for reconsideration of clause 4 and clause 7. That wording, of course, is necessary in order to comply with the rules of the House. The purpose of the amendment is to have the committee consider the advisability of striking out parts of clause 4 and clause 7 or, in the alternative, to insert a