

*Price Stability*

As I say, I do not think it is in keeping with the parliamentary process that once the government has proposed a committee and set out its terms of reference there should be nothing we can do about it but vote yes or no. I agree with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that there are limits, that if there is a proposal to discuss some aspect of the CNR you cannot drag into it the CPR. I do not agree with what he would not allow to be included under that heading, but I agree there are limits.

I submit, however, that the amendment of the hon. member for Wellington-Grey is well within those limits. I do not want to suggest that there is any weakness in my argument, or in that of the hon. member for Peace River. I do not want to leave any thought that Your Honour can do anything other than rule this amendment in order. But while I am on my feet I should like to make the point that if this amendment is ruled out of order, it does not necessarily follow that all of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North is also out of order. That amendment is like this one in one respect, in that it modifies the terms of reference part of the motion. But there is something else in it altogether, that is, the proposal that instead of its being a committee of both Houses it should be a committee of this House only.

I hope, therefore, that whatever ruling Your Honour makes on this amendment—and I hope it will be favourable—we can have another go at the procedural aspect of the amendment proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I thank hon. members for their contributions. As I indicated earlier, my initial misgivings lay on the central point that has been discussed by all three hon. members, namely, whether this amendment raises a new and substantive question or whether it is simply an amplification. The hon. member for Peace River 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 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 hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre 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 by way of a ruling. That is something that a 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 hon. 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 consulted 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 of Alberta. I will read parts of his ruling:

On the matter of whether this amendment can be received at all, I would draw hon. members' attention to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 291—

That is the citation I was going to use in dealing with this amendment.

—which reads as follows:

“When the House is considering a motion, of which notice has been given, for the appointment of a select committee, a member cannot move in amendment that the committee be given wider powers than those which were set down in the notice”.