

regular support of the Social Credit party if he ever stole members from that party.

If we analyse those words, and if we refer back to the words in the motion we find:

The matters raised by the hon. member for Labelle.

If the size and extent of our terms of reference are to be left to the steering committee, I think we should have some direction in that regard so that difficulties in the future could be avoided.

Mr. MOREAU: I was wondering if the statement made by the member from Bow River, which was both a lengthy statement and a motion, would be included in the terms of reference before the committee?

Mr. WOOLLIAMS: Might I speak to that? After all, we are to a certain extent confined in this matter. Surely our direction comes from the House of Commons and surely we are controlled by that direction in this matter. The motion reads:

That the matters raised by the hon. member for Labelle in his question of privilege as reported in *Hansard* for Monday, April 27, 1964, be referred to the committee on privileges and elections for consideration and report.

I have read the matter raised by the member from Labelle. Those are the terms of reference. The terms of reference are described by the motion; the motion describes what kind of a house we are confined to live in, in reference to this matter and how many rooms we have. I would say that surely the motion is very clear and we should not have too much difficulty, but I would like some direction on whether this matter should be left to the steering committee or discussed by the committee.

Mr. SCOTT: I think Mr. Woolliams has unduly limited the scope of the inquiry. I think the steering committee should consider that we are to investigate all of the circumstances surrounding the transfer of the member in question from one party to the other, and I think the terms of reference he has used are perhaps unduly limiting, taking into consideration that he would want to raise perhaps all matters surrounding this question.

Mr. FISHER: On the face of it, it would seem to me the steering committee should require the presence as witnesses of the three members of parliament who seem to be involved, that is Mr. Girouard, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Thompson as well as Mr. Davey. However, I hope, having said that, that it does not mean that if something comes up in evidence we are going to limit ourselves to the people in that group. There is no suggestion of that, is there?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: So far nothing has yet been said definitely as to what the ground rules will be for the hearing. The suggestion that has been put forth, as I understand it, is that we define the list of witnesses. From what Mr. Woolliams said, I understand that he considers we should set down the ground rules for the hearing; that this be dealt with by the steering committee, be brought back, and that the committee should either accept or reject it at that time. This has been the custom in the past. I am merely pointing out that it has been customary that the steering committee go into session, do these things which are now suggested, come back to the committee and that these things be either accepted or rejected in committee. I would suggest this might be the order to follow. When we know what the steering committee has suggested, then we will have grounds for argument on whether we are on the right track or not.

If Mr. Nielsen would be kind enough to include the suggestion put forth by Mr. Woolliams in his motion, confining the boundaries of the hearing plus the list of witnesses and so forth, I would put the question.