

*Income Tax Act*

have our artillery, infantry and cavalry at strategic points. Hopefully, Your Honour will recognize and give effect to the glorious battalion of words used by my friend the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), which I think will be supported by other members.

We come back to citation 382. I will deal with that in a little detail and relate it to this amendment. It provides:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill—

I stop there. I draw to Your Honour's attention the words "any special reasons". These must be reasons which persuade a member of this House to take steps over and above the usual remedy which he might have when voting on a bill or proposing a six months hoist. There must be some scope for him, if we are to have meaningful, clearcut, precise debate on issues brought forward on, as my hon. friend said, a joinder of issues. There must be special reasons for not wanting the bill to be passed standing by itself, not by voting against it and not by proposing a six months hoist but by saying that (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) are the special reasons he is advancing for, using the words of the citation—

—not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions—

The hon. member for Edmonton West has included in this resolution special reasons for not agreeing to second reading of the bill. He makes this quite plain in his amendment which uses these words:

This House deeply concerned with unacceptable levels of inflation . . . declines to give second reading to a bill which does not provide sufficient stimulus to the economy of Canada with appropriate tax cuts—

They are the special reasons. They are squarely within the four corners of citation 382 which the hon. member has used in an effort to persuade the Chair that he does not agree, and that other hon. members should join him in not agreeing to second reading of this bill. A resolution which he is entitled to move pursuant to this citation is as follows:

—a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill—

Obviously, in a bill as lengthy, as complex and covering as many subjects as Bill C-259 there cannot be said to be one single principle. On that aspect, it is not easy for a member to use this as a peg on which to hang his argument. In addition to that the citation covers:

—the principles, policy, or provisions—

I pluck out of this citation the word "provisions". The hon. member for Edmonton West is stating his reasons for not agreeing to second reading of Bill C-259. He has moved an amendment adverse to or differing from the provisions of the bill. Within the four corners of an amendment of this kind you cannot fill in all the details and particulars as to clauses. Even if the hon. member tried to do that, Your Honour would probably rule him out of order.

The hon. member has said that because he does not like the over-all provisions of this bill he is asking the House to

[Mr. Baldwin.]

join with him in an amendment which disagrees with the provisions of the bill because it does not provide sufficient stimulus to the economy of Canada with appropriate tax cuts and incentives, and does not contain adequate exemptions. In this way the hon. member is putting on record a resolution that is declaratory of a principle adverse to the provisions of the bill. I quote further from citation 382:

—or otherwise opposed to its progress—

• (5:40 p.m.)

My hon. friend is saying, I suggest, that because the bill fails to provide sufficient stimulus to the economy by using appropriate tax cuts and incentives, and because it does not make provision for adequate tax exemptions, we are opposed to its further progress. How much further can we go in attempting to place before the House in clearcut terms an opportunity for the House to divide?

It is all very well to say that hon. members can express these views in the course of debate, but I think the House is entitled to have the opportunity to consider motions which will divide the House and compel the government to take a stand, to declare that it approves or disapproves. Obviously, in light of what has already been said by the minister and his supporters, and judging from government policies in the past, members opposite will vote against the amendment and no doubt it will be defeated. But that is not the point. It is our right, I contend, to place the government in a position from which it cannot easily extricate itself through its continued objection to reasoned amendments.

We have reached a point at which there is increasingly little opportunity for hon. members, on second reading, to direct consideration to the reasons for which they believe the principle of a bill should be opposed. There is little opportunity for them to put forward motions of this kind, making it clear why in their view bills coming before the House ought not to be supported.

The other day, speaking to a point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) I had occasion to put on record two reasoned amendments which had been accepted in the United Kingdom parliament. I have other examples I should like to place before the House now. While we are not bound, of course, by these U.K. precedents, I think I am entitled to say that the origin of our practice here is the practice in the United Kingdom. In recent years the practice in the United Kingdom has gone a great deal further than was originally allowed. In 1948, Mr. Churchill moved the following as a reasoned amendment:

This House, while recognizing the necessity for an equitable scheme of redistribution, declines to give a third reading to a bill which repudiates agreed recommendations of Mr. Speaker's Conference, 1944, and disregards for the purpose of party advantage the findings of the Boundary Commission, thereby bringing discredit on ministers of the Crown and lowering the traditional standards of our public life.

In 1961, on second reading of a bill dealing with Commonwealth immigration, the following amendment was moved and accepted as a reasoned amendment:

This House declines to give a second reading to a bill which, without adequate inquiry and without full discussion at a meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, removes from Commonwealth citizens the long standing right of free entry to Britain, and