

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, some of its Members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Howe, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by adding thereto, immediately after the word “appointed”, the following: “to inquire into the causes, processes and consequences of inflation and”

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I indicated earlier, my initial misgivings lay on the central point that has been discussed by all three honourable Members, namely, whether this amendment raises a new and substantive question or whether it is simply an amplification.

The honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) argued that it was simply a clarification of the motion, and he drew my attention to the terms of reference of the Prices and Incomes Commission. Unfortunately, I do not have the terms of reference of the Prices and Incomes Commission before me and therefore I cannot really use them in trying to decide on the procedural validity of the amendment.

I must say I have much sympathy for the position taken by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) in his general proposition that amendments should not always be ruled out of order on procedural grounds. There may be a higher argument, referred to as the political process, which should allow for a greater degree of flexibility, and he may have a very good point. But I am not in a position to achieve that higher purpose. That is something that the Procedure Committee of the House will have to look into, and I think it is a perfectly valid point. One of the most difficult things for a Speaker is to be caught in the position of ruling out amendments proposed by honourable Members. However, unfortunately, from time to time this is the position in which we find ourselves and we are bound to be guided by the precedent and citations we have available to us.

In trying to decide whether in fact this is a new or substantive question, for which notice should have been given, or an amplification, I considered the motion, and the operative section seems to me to be the following: “...the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Price Stability, be appointed to consider reports of the Prices and Incomes Commission, and such other related reports or papers as may be referred to the committee.”

That seems to be a very specific provision of the motion. The amendment is to amend that motion to include the following: “to inquire into the causes, processes and consequences of inflation”.

Faced with that, and without the benefit of the terms of reference of the Prices and Incomes Commission before me, I have had to decide, and I have decided, that in fact this is virtually a new, substantive question. Having made that decision, I was then required to consult previous rulings by Speakers, and also Beauchesne. I have here one ruling which combines both the citations from Beauchesne, which I was going to use, plus previous rulings. It is a ruling given by Mr. Speaker Michener on December 7, 1962 which came about as the result of a point of order raised by a distinguished Member from the Province