

Review Board should have power to order rollbacks. The fact of the matter is that in that committee this matter has been dealt with, which proves that at least the chairman of that committee felt that it was a proper subject of discussion in the committee, namely, rollbacks on food prices. The proposal did not carry because of the votes that took place in that committee, but the right of the House to give a committee the authority to reconsider a proposition is clearly sustained in the various citations that I have read.

Therefore, in summary I contend that the hon. member for Peace River was not as astute as he usually is when he tried to see any comparison between the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham and the amendment now before us. The former amendment went beyond the terms of reference of the committee, but the one now before Your Honour is within the terms of reference of the original committee and we think it is proper for the House to ask the committee to reconsider its position on this important matter.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, in reading the short debate that took place on April 17, 1973, Mr. Speaker made the point that he could not accept the motion moved by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham because it was a new question and therefore a 48-hour notice had to be provided in the usual way. I will quote briefly from the argument Mr. Speaker made as reported on page 3393 of *Hansard* of April 17, as follows:

I think that is one of the arguments which could have been submitted in support of the amendment proposed by the hon. member, but he himself recognizes that what he has put before the House is a new term of reference and, therefore, a new question. Certainly, the House is entitled to consider a new question. However, if it is a substantive motion which is proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham, then he has to satisfy the other requirement of the Standing Orders, which is that 48 hours' notice of any new question or new motion shall be given unless the motion is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43 and there is unanimous consent.

The question to be decided is whether the proposition which has been advanced by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore is, indeed, a new question or not. The question here is that the Prices Review Board be reconstituted with full power to require the cancellation or rollback of unjustified price increases. It seems to be a question of substance going far beyond what was included in either the first or the second report. Indeed, I believe that an argument could be made that the question of the rollback of prices by the federal authority is far beyond the legislative competence of the House of Commons. Therefore, I would submit to Your Honour that it is indeed a matter of substance. It is a matter of new business, and therefore the motion is not acceptable under those conditions.

• (1650)

The other point I wish to make is that the committee still has its original terms of reference before it. That committee is still sitting. It will have a meeting tomorrow. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) is to be the witness.

I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to citation 220(1) in *Beauchesne's Fourth Edition* at page 182. He is speaking of the instruction or the motion which gives a

Food Prices

committee power to do whatever is contained in the motion, and he says:

If the subject-matter of an instruction is within the scope of the question referred to the committee then such instruction is useless and irregular.

If one accepts the principle that the committee is still sitting, still has its original terms of reference before it and, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) pointed out, had already discussed this matter, then it seems to me that according to this citation the motion to amend the second report is useless and irregular.

Mr. Broadbent: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to comment on the observations that we just heard against the acceptability of the amendment. The point was made that the subject matter contained in the amendment introduced new material and for that reason should be ruled out on procedural grounds. The crucial point is that the so-called new material included in the amendment is new only in terms of the report of the committee to the House. Surely, this is the crucial procedural question. It is not new in terms of the authority given to that committee by this body. That is the crucial point at stake here.

The hon. member would have been absolutely correct in his argument if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Grier) had gone beyond the terms of reference given to the committee by this House. But precisely because the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore took great care to stay within the terms of reference given to the committee then it seems to me it is clearly acceptable.

It is inappropriate to argue, as the government spokesman has done, that an amendment has to be ruled out because of the contents of the committee's report. In fact, the committee during its meetings discussed at some considerable length the subject matter that is included in the amendment moved on behalf of the NDP by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore. On that crucial ground, I think it is fully within the terms of reference of the committee, and Your Honour should rule in favour of its acceptability.

I should like now to turn to the original objections made to this motion by the Conservative party. The argument that is crucial in that respect against the Conservative spokesman, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), is that his reference to the April 17 decision of the Speaker is a totally wrong reference, it in fact being one that supports the acceptability of the amendment rather than the argument against it. At that time the terms of reference were clearly exceeded by the Conservative motion, and therefore Mr. Speaker appropriately ruled it out. On this occasion the terms of reference are clearly sufficient to include the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore, and therefore it should be considered totally acceptable.

However, for the Conservative party to enter into this kind of procedural debate on an issue which it said was so important, shows the almost unqualified degree of hypocrisy which that party has in facing this issue. Conserva-