

Anti-Inflation Act

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The House heard what was said. I think it is entitled to have a little more responsibility from the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You have twisted his meaning.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): If he has some distinct proposal different from that which he put forward in the election campaign with regard to the inflation problem, I think the House is entitled to hear it. Until such time, I think the House is entitled to support the carefully articulated program I have laid before the House.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wise)—Trade—Request for reduction in cheese import quotas; the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay)—Mirabel—Request for tabling of data on which Sky Shops awarded franchise; the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez)—Finance—Suggested withdrawal of tax concessions to Falconbridge Nickel on operations in Namibia.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR RESTRAINT OF PROFIT MARGINS, PRICES, DIVIDENDS AND COMPENSATION

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-73, to provide for the restraint of profit margins, prices, dividends and compensation in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I said earlier that I would come to the House at five o'clock to hear further argument about the procedural regularity of motion No. 1. Do hon. members wish to make any submissions?

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, we have nothing further to say at this time about motion No. 1 as all the arguments were made in the debate on motion No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: If there is no further discussion on motion No. 1, let me say that the opinion of the Chair remains the

[Mr. Stanfield.]

same, namely, that motion No. 1 would propose to include in the legislation an entirely new concept, outside the scope of the bill, and is therefore procedurally unacceptable; particularly, I might say, in relation to the particular clause it seeks to amend. It is out of order, therefore, on two procedural grounds.

● (1700)

In so far as motion No. 2 is concerned, I previously indicated that it is in order. It has already been discussed. That, I would think, settles those procedural points. However, today a much broader point was raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I indicated that I would allow some time to elapse in order to see whether there might be a resolution. I understand that this measure will not be called tomorrow. If there is agreement or an understanding in the House that, in any circumstances, all votes on the report stage amendments will be deferred until the next day that this measure is called, that will allow discussion to continue. It will perhaps allow time for further discussion to resolve the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, there is only one difficulty that might arise out of that. That is the existence of Standing Order 75(6) which would have to be waived by unanimous consent. It states that if there is to be a recommendation referring to an amendment in a bill—in other words, an amendment to the recommendation—24 hours' clear notice must be given in writing.

Therefore, if you, Mr. Speaker, were to defer your ruling until Thursday, and if it were to be favourable to my proposition, the government would then be forced to put in the amending recommendation. There would be a 24-hour wait, which would carry into Friday. I rather suspect that proceedings would effectively be stopped. On the other hand, if Your Honour were able to give a ruling today, we could possibly get together and work out a satisfactory amendment to the recommendation. This would allow the proceedings to go forward on Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: I prefer not to give a definitive ruling because the ruling I come down with may be as a result of some discussion. I thought I made it clear that I fail to see much of a defect in the argument put forward by the hon. member for Edmonton West. I do not want to go into details that might necessarily tie the hands of the parties in attempting to come to a resolution. I thought I had made my sentiments clear. Let us hope that the matter may be resolved in some way.

Is it agreed and so ordered that at whatever point the discussion might terminate tonight, the votes on the motions will be deferred until the next day that this measure is called on government orders, which under no circumstances will be tomorrow?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset that I was a little surprised at the rather discourteous response of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) to the central thrust of the argument of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in favour of his amendment. The minister suggested the