

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Mahoney,—That Bill C-8, An Act to authorize the making of certain fiscal payments to provinces, to authorize the entry into tax collection agreements with provinces, and to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to a Committee of the Whole of Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act;

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) concerning the procedure and practices of the House in relation to budgetary proposals.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think honourable Members would want me to go into detailed references on the interesting point of order raised by the honourable Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The point he is making, I think, has been explained, and is supported to some extent by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

While the honourable Member for Edmonton West was speaking there was a thought going through my mind that perhaps he was not entirely right when he suggested that under the old rules there was a procedural requirement that there be a budget presentation. According to the advice or information that I have, there has never been such a requirement in the rules. There has been a practice, under the old rules, that there be a budget presentation, but there was nothing in the Standing Orders, as they existed then, requiring that a budget presentation be made.

With respect to the honourable Member's suggestion that it is a new procedure to have a ways and means bill, which is based on a presentation of a budget in a previous session, it has been brought to my attention that perhaps this has been done before, more particularly in the year 1962, where the index has a reference to a budget resolution passed in a previous session. This in itself is an indication that even in the year 1962 this procedure was followed.

It has also been brought to my attention that there was a ruling by then Mr. Speaker Lambert, which is reported at page 133 of the *Journals* for 1962, regarding

the requirement of whether ways and means legislation be preceded by a budget presentation. I am sure the honourable Member remembers the circumstances very well.

The only motion under the old rules was one to the effect that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair. On those occasions no one knew whether there would be a budget presentation or not. That was the point which the honourable Member for Edmonton West, in his then capacity as Speaker of the House, made. He was perfectly right, and I agree with him.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want to get involved in debate with the honourable Member. I agree with the ruling which he made at that time, and I say that although the rules have been changed since then the principle continues the same, and there is still no procedural requirement for a budget presentation. There was none procedurally then for a bill effecting the ways and means resolution to be based on a budget presentation.

I appreciate the point made by the honourable Member for Edmonton West. It is the kind of difficulty which perhaps results from the drafting of the new rules as they are before us now. The honourable Member for Edmonton West, and his distinguished colleague, the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, are leading members of the committee on procedure, and they do from time to time consider some of these difficulties. This is one of the difficulties which they might like to look into some day.

Having said this, I would think that I would have to rule that the bill is now before us correctly from a procedural standpoint.

And debate arising on the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), seconded by Mr. Laing (Vancouver South),—That Bill C-169, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

And the House continuing in Committee;

At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

[*Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)*]

(*Notices of Motions*)

Mr. Southam, seconded by Mr. Howe, moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the government should con-