withdraw his amendment, and I think that the only way that we are going to make any progress is to put the question again.

Does the committee agree to the withdrawal of the motion of the hon. member for New Westminster?

[*English*]

Does the committee give unanimous consent to allowing the hon. member for New Westminster to withdraw the amendment that is before the committee?

Mr. Aiken: Once again, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for New Westminster should stand in this House and indicate his consent to its withdrawal. I have no objection at all to that being done if that is his wish, but I think it would be up to the hon. member to indicate that he is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Chairman, I am told that the hon. member concerned is not here today. However according to the statement made by the hon. member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine the hon. member for New Westminster has agreed to withdraw his amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. parliamentary secretary knows that this amendment can only be withdrawn with the unanimous consent of the House. If the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka maintains his objection there will be no other solution for the committee than to discuss that amendment and to vote on it.

[*English*]

The Chair is inviting hon. members to co-operate, and to give the Chair guidance, so we can come to a quick decision and proceed with the work of the committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka is quite correct in saying that an amendment can be withdrawn only if the mover so requests. However, I think the hon. member would agree with me that if any member of the House can stand and say that he is so doing on behalf, and with the approval, of that hon. member, then we can accept it. I believe that what bothers us up to this point is that we have had vague statements on the part of certain hon. members opposite that the hon. member for New Westminster will agree to this but that is all. If we can have a firm statement from an hon. member that he is doing it at the request of the hon. member for New Westminister, then I believe we would accept it.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say that the hon. member for New Westminister has explicitly authorized me to withdraw his amendment.

However, after proposing his amendment the hon. member for New Westminster had a talk with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and agreed to accept the proposal of the department.

In order not to delay the proceedings, I would suggest that the clause be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In that case, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment should be withdrawn at this point. After all, we have to protect every member in this respect. Either the matter stands and we move to something else, or the amendment will have to be put to a vote. If the government wants it defeated, it can soon defeat it, so why not call the vote?

Mr. Béchard: That is what I said, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment should stand.

Mr. Aiken: Let us vote on it now and get it out of the way.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair cannot accept the suggestion made by the parliamentary secretary that the amendment stand. If the government wishes to suggest to the committee that the clause be stood, then the Chair would have no objection.

[*Translation*]

But I must point out to the hon. member that it is quite difficult for the Chair to suspend the debate on this amendment and let the government introduce another one on the clause now under consideration. If the government is ready to allow clause 167 to stand, I think that it would be acceptable to the committee.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Deputy Chairman: The question is on the amendment moved by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth).

Amendment (Mr. Hogarth) negatived on division: Yeas, 23; Nays, 50.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be made clear that in voting against the amendment we just disposed of we are not opposing—

Mr. McCleave: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Probably the Chair was just about to do the same thing the hon. member is attempting to do. The minister knows he is not allowed, under the Standing Orders of the House, to comment on any vote taken previously.

Mr. Gray: Your point is well taken, Mr. Chairman. It is my intention to comment not on the vote but on the point of view expressed by the hon. member for New Westmister. Because his point appeared to have validity, we are prepared at this time to move an amendment which we think will give recognition to the point of view he has expressed. I should like at this time to move the following amendment:

That section 167 as set forth in clause 1 of the said Bill be amended

(a) by striking out lines 14 to 26 on page 441 and substituting the following:

Application to Review Board for time extension

167. (1) Where no objection to an assessment under section 165 or appeal to the Tax Review Board under section 169 has been made or instituted within the time limited by section 165 or 169, as the case may be, for doing so, an application may be made to the Tax Review Board for an order extending the time within which a notice of objection may be served or an appeal instituted and the