

Price Stability

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I assume from the contemplative look on your face that you are disposed to give the matter some thought. I know Your Honour and your advisers will be looking very seriously at Standing Order 47. May I point out that the specific wording of that Standing Order deals with what would appear to be a possible prohibition from making an amendment of this kind when there is reference of a question to Committee of the Whole—this reference is not to Committee of the Whole—to a standing committee, and this reference is not to a standing committee, or to a special committee. With due respect, I suggest that the words “special committee” refer to special committee of the House. It may well be that if it was intended to inhibit this type of amendment with regard to a special joint committee, the words “special joint committee” would be inserted therein.

The people who framed the rule said that you cannot refer it to Committee of the Whole, you cannot refer it to a standing committee, nor can you refer it to a special committee, which can only be a special committee of the House. There is a general rule of law applied here, that the mention of the one is the exclusion of the other, and we are not mentioning special joint committee. I can see a good reason for that. When we have a joint committee, which includes the Senate as well as the House, quite obviously we are beyond the rule, so the failure to include in these specific words the designation of the type of committee to which reference can be made and in respect of which there can be no amendment means it does not cover a special joint committee.

I am sure that my words will commend themselves to Your Honour and that when you have considered the matter you will be quite happy to accept this sound and salutary amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I should like to clarify the position of the Chair at this stage. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) was quite right when he indicated that he suspected I have some objections in this regard. The preliminary objections I have do not really lie within the area he discussed. My worry lies in the fact that the amendment may expand the motion before us beyond the contents of the original notice.

I am prepared to hear an argument now. However, I was going to suggest that I would take the matter under advisement so that I could consult the relevant citations and the

learned officers of the table before ruling. If it is agreeable—and I do not want to prevent the hon. member for Peace River or the minister speaking, if they so wish—I would prefer to make a ruling after I have had a chance for further consultation.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, there is a reason for my wishing to say a few words at this point, and while I am on my feet I shall disclose my reason. First, may I say that if consideration has to be given to the procedural admissibility of the proposed amendment, I would like to argue that it does have validity. I heard what Your Honour said about enlarging the terms of reference, but I would ask that in your consideration of the matter you look at and study citations 201, 202 and 203 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. These are the citations that set down the general rules about amendments, suggesting that they can leave out certain words, put some other words in, and so on. But these citations also say that there has to be relevancy. I should like to read the following from citation 203:

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject-matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

It seems to me that in view of the fact that the motion in the name of the minister asks the special committee to consider the reports of the Prices and Incomes Commission, surely anything that comes within the ambit of the work of the Prices and Incomes Commission is relevant. I know of nothing more relevant than the causes, processes and consequences of inflation. Therefore, it would seem to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat is one that should be considered in order.

• (4:00 p.m.)

However, I said I would indicate my particular reason for intervening at this point. It so happens that the next speaker is to be my friend and colleague from Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), and I hope that I am not stealing his thunder if I indicate that he proposes to move an amendment. Until the present amendment has been ruled on, is my colleague's amendment an amendment or a subamendment? If there is no ruling at this point, I should like to suggest that my colleague be permitted to present his amendment subject to Your Honour's ruling on the first one. If the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington-Grey (Mr. Howe) is