

urgent consideration, namely, the immediate need for the government to amend the Anti-Inflation Act to provide for a right of appeal from a decision of the Anti-Inflation Board and/or the administrator to either party affected by such a decision, a necessity vividly illustrated by and urgently warranted in response to the decision of the administrator in the Irving Pulp and Paper case whereby one of the aggrieved parties, namely, the union, was accorded no right of appeal from a decision affecting the livelihood of its members, and the further necessity of preventing a total breakdown of the free, collective bargaining system throughout the economy by ensuring an equitable appeals process and the compelling need for the House to debate the necessity for such an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member yesterday put forward a very similar motion, and at some length I indicated that with considerable regret I was not able to accede to the request. With slight modification, with all due respect, the hon. member has repeated the application today.

It is the nature of the Standing Order that if circumstances change, then in fact not only is it possible for hon. members to bring forward for a second or third time an application under the same Standing Order, but on occasions in the past the Chair has invited hon. members to do so. However, where repeated applications are made one day after the other without any suggestion that the circumstances have changed in the interval, it is very difficult for the Chair not to regard that simply as an attempt to appeal on Tuesday the ruling of the Chair on Monday. I say that only by way of general admonition to the hon. member.

On the other hand, there is not substantial disagreement about the circumstances of the case, nor is there any disagreement on any side—obviously, by the nature of the questions asked again today—about the importance of the matter. Where there is fundamental disagreement between the hon. member and the Chair is whether Standing Order 26 ought to be used to reopen legislation which was passed recently by the House and which in its operation is perhaps aggrieving a substantial number of parties in the country. But in fact it is doing so by the operation of legislation which must, in the opinion of the Chair, have been envisaged when the legislation was passed by this House.

The difference between the hon. member and the Chair in this instance is that where pressure, as his notice of motion puts forward today, is for an amendment to that legislation, it is the opinion of the Chair that amendment ought to be sought in the way it is being sought daily, through questions and, presumably, in other ways which are open to hon. members to seek amendments to legislation.

However, where there is no indication that there is some dereliction in the performing of duties under the legislation, or some breakdown in it, I suggest, with the greatest respect to all hon. members using the question period, that the "late show" is available; that the estimates of the minister will be tabled, I understand, tomorrow, and the minister will be before the standing committee where he can be questioned in much more detail and in a much more continuing manner. There are a number of ways open to all

Non-Canadian Publications

hon. members to seek improvements and amendments to the legislation.

Where there is disagreement is that if the legislation which was passed by this House a short time ago is having precisely its intended effect, and parties are aggrieved by it, I do not see that that is a cause for the use of Standing Order 26. There is a fundamental disagreement between the hon. member and other hon. members and the Chair in that respect. However, that is the opinion the Chair holds, and this is the second consecutive day upon which the Chair has made that ruling.

If there is in fact some circumstance which alters the situation, the Chair is more than open to entertain further applications under the Standing Order. But I should repeat that where the allegations are, as they are in the notice of motion of the hon. member today and yesterday, that the legislation is having an effect which aggrieves certain parties but which is the intended effect of the legislation, it is the view of the Chair that that is not a ground for the use of emergency procedures pursuant to Standing Order 26, no matter how important that effect may be. There is no doubt, particularly backed up by the questions of hon. members again today, that it is an important area and that it is having a very serious effect. The only disagreement is about the use of Standing Order 26 in that particular situation.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

REMOVAL OF PROVISIONS ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Monday, February 16, consideration of Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate at ten o'clock last night. It is fortunate that there are no regulations in this bill to be implemented by a minister, thereby creating a serious situation, and we would certainly be as rough on a minister of national revenue if he were guilty of laches in preparing and presenting regulations. I think I have traversed all the arguments I wished to put forward to this House with regard to the amendment before us, and I seek the support of hon. members opposite and earnestly ask them to vote in favour of the amendment. On that note, we are ready for the vote.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question!