

*Taxation Reform*

it counsel and certain witnesses, that would perhaps be adding to the instructions of the committee. All you are properly concerned with, Mr. Speaker, is whether this amendment altogether changes another document.

I am like Browning; I believe that only God and the people who drew the document really know what is in it. The government really thinks the committees are creatures of its creation. Parliament controls the committees, and surely we can say what we should do when studying this difficult and comprehensive document. I think this is the problem. Surely my good friends are not frightened of this amendment coming to a vote.

**Mr. Baldwin:** They almost were the other day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) seems to want to add to the argument. I doubt that anything new can be said at this point. I have heard learned argument from experts in procedure. Having said that, however, I would be pleased to hear also from the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to steal the show from the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), the experts on rules and procedure, but I do wish to raise one point.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** How did I get into this?

**Mr. Lundrigan:** I gather that Your Honour is concerned that perhaps the amendment tends to eliminate the original motion. I certainly would not support any amendment that was so restrictive that it directed the committee to take specific action such as was the situation, for example, a few days ago when a committee was directed to reduce the voting age to 18. I should like to draw attention to something that was touched on by the hon. member for Peace River. I believe that on two grounds the amendment ought to be ruled in order. First of all, it does not give specific direction to the committee. The amendment is very broad. It refers to developing alternatives, and in that regard it is in very broad terms.

Having spent the last two weeks studying in detail the white paper on taxation, I suggest to Your Honour that the amendment gets at the very guts, if I may use that term, of the white paper. The very broad areas in the

white paper to which we feel Parliament should take exception are covered in this amendment. On the ground that we are giving the committee very little direction, and on the ground that the amendment we propose gets to the essence of the objections of the House to the white paper, I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). On the basis of Standing Order 65(8) I feel we have no alternative but to let the House rule on the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank hon. members for their counsel. I thank each one in turn for the assistance he has extended to the Chair. Hon. members must realize that the Chair has to rule strictly on procedural grounds. A number of the arguments presented were in some way substantive. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) referred to the substance of what he called the red manifesto. I think he indicated that perhaps the Chair should study this document and decide whether the amendment would or would not affect the substance of it. The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) presented an argument along much the same lines. Fortunately, the Chair does not have to go into that aspect of things before rendering the type of judgment it must render at the present time. The situation is more simple than that.

The hon. member for Peace River and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) in the course of their arguments have shown that they understand exactly what the difficulty is. It is not necessary to indicate to them what are the worries of the Chair. What we must determine now is whether it is possible to amend this type of very simple and basic motion to the effect that a certain document be referred to a committee. In my view, it is very difficult to amend this kind of motion. I find it difficult to imagine any amendment that would be in order. Hon. members might even wonder whether it is necessary, in the first instance, to have this type of motion at all. That might be a very good point to consider. But that is not the kind of argument in which the Chair should become involved.

The effect of the motion is that this document be referred to a committee. That is the only proposition with which I must deal. The hon. member for Peace River said that in his view there are many arguments to support the proposition that the amendment is acceptable, the best one of course being that he seconded it. I might say that perhaps that is