

Mr. Reid: We will see who wins the argument.

Mr. Lawrence: I believe the only other point the hon. member made, Mr. Speaker, was that this amendment falls entirely within the scope of the decision made earlier this afternoon by the Chair. This amendment is quite a bit different in its phraseology, and quite a bit different in its scope, from the amendment moved two days ago by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) because, as was pointed out by the Chair this afternoon in the Chair's decision, that particular amendment indicated part approval of the bill and part disapproval of the bill. In its decision this afternoon, the Chair indicated that certainly on second reading a reasoned amendment in this House is acceptable under our system and under our rules.

● (1650)

If the Chair takes that position—and I think it is a very valid position and I am not criticizing it at all—the next question we have to face is, what can members do on second reading? If we can move an amendment, and if we can do something on second reading other than move six months' hoist or other than voting against the bill on second reading, we must then ask the question, what is it that we can do? The Chair has said that under our rules and practice a reasoned amendment is acceptable. I would submit to you, sir that in respect of an omnibus taxation bill such as we are discussing here, in which there is no single principle but a whole bundle of principles and a whole bundle of policies, the Chair would be putting us in a ridiculous and untoward position if it ruled that we had to bring in, in the form of a reasoned amendment, an amendment which disapproves of each and every one of the principles or policies contained in that omnibus bill.

I would submit to you, sir, that if that was the thrust of the Chair's prior decision, this will give you an opportunity of correcting that, because if we did oppose every single policy contained in every clause in the omnibus tax bill, then clearly our amendment would be out of order as the Chair could very readily come to the conclusion that the proper course of action for us to take on second reading would be to oppose the bill completely and vote no on second reading.

I do not believe that was the thrust of the Chair's decision. Obviously, in an omnibus tax bill such as we are considering here there are many principles and many policies included, as there must be. I would submit to you that if reasoned amendments are to be permitted—and the Chair very clearly indicated that reasoned amendments are going to be entertained—then it is certainly within our purview to pick out one, two, three or any number we want, indicating in the reasoned amendments our strict disapproval, as well as some constructive alternative, as I have attempted to do in my amendment, in respect of one or other of the principles contained in the bill. I think that is very important in a reasoned amendment. I think a reasoned amendment has attached to it not only the thrust that we should oppose the principle of the bill, but as well that we should propose something else, and that is exactly what I have tried to do in the amendment before you.

If the Chair's ruling means that we have to oppose every single principle of the bill, I suggest that the whole idea of a reasoned amendment on second reading is a farce,

Income Tax

because then the proper course of action for us, if we feel that way, is to vote no on second reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members must understand that, taking into account an earlier decision by Mr. Speaker which was brought to the attention of the House by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Reid), I may be off-balance in looking at this amendment although I must do so with the most fairness.

The hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Lawrence) has brought to the attention of the Chair some very valid points regarding the opportunity for an hon. member to move a second reading amendment other than a six or three months' hoist. It is my opinion that the hon. member, on behalf of his party, has gone out of his way to find some way to meet the requirements not only of the Chair but of the precedents in moving an amendment that is acceptable.

On the other hand, the parliamentary secretary, as I said earlier, drew the attention of the Chair to a previous ruling by Mr. Speaker this afternoon which rejected the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). He did not really further his point very much, but he also added that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham would have the effect of putting a burden on the Crown by reducing, ipso facto, governmental revenue.

In addition, he suggested that what the hon. member was trying to achieve at this time could be achieved at a later stage. I am not sure that this could be achieved easily. In looking at the amendment before me, with a feeling in respect of what hon. members in the House seem to be trying to do at this stage of second reading of this bill, I wonder if I should not look at the amendment with an open view and without trying to be as restrictive as one might by just looking at the rule book or the precedents.

To my mind, although the amendment before us at this time might not be drafted in the best way to show a clear and strong opposition to the general principle of the bill, it is opposed to the passage of the bill and does oppose the basic principles of taxation within the bill. As I said earlier, I do not think it would be easy for the hon. member who proposed the amendment, or any other hon. member, to move a comparable amendment at a later stage in committee of the whole.

Although there might be some fault in respect of the wording of the amendment in meeting the entire requirements noted and enumerated in May's eighteenth edition at pages 487 and 488, to my mind the purpose the hon. member is trying to achieve is to move an amendment which attacks the substantive taxation parts of the bill. For these reasons, I would have the tendency at this time to accept the amendment in its present form.

● (1700)

Before I call it five o'clock, I wonder if the House would allow the hon. member who had the floor at the time the amendment was moved to move the adjournment of the debate, taking into account the fact that we will be going into other proceedings at eight o'clock.