

Taxation Reform

the only good argument for accepting it. I wonder whether it is necessary to do this, but for the record I shall read the motion again.

That the White Paper entitled Proposals for Tax Reform, Tabled in the House on November 7, 1969, be referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

As I have indicated, it may well be that the committee could have easily, on its own initiative, studied this document without the initiative of the government in referring the document to the committee. However, this is the motion which has been proposed and which is being considered by hon. members. That is the motion which is before the House for debate today and on Monday. The amendment reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by adding the following to it:

with instructions to develop alternatives to the proposed disincentives affecting middle income groups and small businesses in particular, and which increase the vulnerability of Canadian enterprise to foreign take-overs.

As I said, the motion is a simple one. It proposes the reference to a standing committee of a document which deals with tax reform. The motion before the House can, I suppose, in some way be amended. But certainly the amendment proposed would have to be relevant to and have the effect of amending the main motion. It must not seek to amend the question which the motion would refer to the committee for consideration. That is the whole point of argument. What we are trying to do through this amendment is go behind the motion and alter or affect in some way the substance of the question which will be considered by the committee if the motion were adopted by the House.

● (4:30 p.m.)

In my view, the amendment endeavours to reach behind the motion and attempts to direct the committee to consider certain propositions which would appear to be outside the scope or the content of the motion which is before the House. In effect, the proposed amendment is not only irrelevant in the procedural sense to the motion it purports to amend, but it also seems to raise a new and substantive question which under our standing orders can only be moved after the appropriate notice. In other words, there is the additional difficulty that it not only goes beyond the terms of the simple motion before us at the present time, but it is also in the

[Mr. Speaker.]

form of a substantive motion which can be moved only after appropriate notice.

I should say that Standing Order 47 has the effect of precluding an amendment of this kind. For the benefit of the record I will read the standing order. It reads:

47. A motion to refer a bill, resolution or any question to a Committee of the Whole, or any Standing or Special Committee, shall preclude all amendment of the main question.

I think that hon. members who sought to enlighten the Chair on the question were silent on the effect of Standing Order 47.

Mr. Baldwin: We realized Your Honour would find it!

Mr. Speaker: In the circumstances it is very difficult for the Chair to overlook the provisions of Standing Order 47 and to rule in any other way except that the amendment should not be put to the House.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): May I ask Your Honour a question? On the basis of your ruling, under Standing Order 47 it would be impossible for any member of the opposition or of the government to advance an amendment stating that the committee shall report by date "X", if that were the sense of the House as a result of discussion. I find that rather difficult to accept.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member who just asked the question, having illustriously occupied the chair before the present holder of this office, knows that the Chair does not reply to theoretical questions.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might seek the permission of the House to conclude my remarks. I would require an additional seven minutes.

Mr. Speaker: This would, of course, require the unanimous consent of the House. There is a difficulty in that the hon. member whose motion was to be considered by the House during private members' business may feel that he is being deprived of an opportunity to present his case. I assume that hon. members would want to ensure that the hon. member who would be affected adversely this way would be given an opportunity and priority to present his motion on another occasion. This matter might be considered at this time.

Mr. Baldwin: We are quite impartial as to whether we hear the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) or the hon. member for