

Medicare

we can take issue with that. It is probably because in the opinion of the mover, the hon. member for Simcoe East, these particular sections have not been dealt with that he felt it essential at this time to introduce the amendment. The minister is drawing an assumption. He is entitled to draw an assumption, but like so many assumptions which come from the other side of the house it is an erroneous one. Because of that fact the hon. member for Simcoe East, and we are supporting him, felt it was most essential at this time to introduce this amendment and to include paragraphs (c) and (d). It may be that time will tell which of us is right. I suggest that for the minister to ask you to make your ruling on the assumption that certain legislation which has been passed will produce certain results is drawing a pretty long bow.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their sound and sage advice relative to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe East and seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. The amendment as has been mentioned by hon. members who took part in the discussion, is claimed to be a reasoned amendment and as such must be judged by the principles which have been mentioned in the house previously on numerous occasions, particularly on August 30. At that time, when a reasoned amendment was proposed by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, I expressed my views on the principles which must govern the acceptance of reasoned amendments. These principles are set out chiefly in May's seventeenth edition, page 527. This citation gives three different and alternative categories within which an amendment should fall.

● (5:30 p.m.)

As I have explained, if a reasoned amendment is not acceptable by virtue of the fact that it does not fall within the first of these categories, it can still be acceptable if it falls within the second and third categories enumerated by May's seventeenth edition. This is the point which was made by the hon. member for Kamloops and I am in full agreement with him. Even though the amendment is not declaratory of a principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill, it can still be accepted if it falls within the other two categories.

I find on this ground that I cannot accept the objection raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare who raised the very important question of relevancy. This, of

[Mr. Baldwin.]

course, is a very serious objection inasmuch as the rule provides that all amendments, even reasoned amendments, are subject to the rule of relevancy. The requirement is that an amendment should be strictly relevant.

I have looked at paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the proposed motion, and looking at them objectively they certainly appear to me to be relevant to the bill. The claim made by the minister was that paragraphs (c) and (d) are not strictly relevant inasmuch as at least one of these two is dealt with by the estimates of the Minister of Industry. I would suggest to him that that is not sufficient reason to decide that the matter is not strictly relevant to the principle of the bill before us.

He also stated that paragraphs (c) and (d) are dealt with by other legislative amendments or proposals. On the other hand, I take it that if the hon. member for Simcoe East promotes the acceptance of these principles, it must be because he feels that they are not included in other legislative proposals. I think that the word "adequate" which is used in paragraph (c) is particularly important. The hon. member for Simcoe East may feel that some provision has been made for medical research and training an adequate number of doctors and other medical personnel, but according to this amendment he is suggesting that these provisions are not adequate.

I would think it is a matter for argument whether the proposals made by the hon. member for Simcoe East are or are not included in these other legislative proposals or enactments. I would have to study these enactments to express an opinion. At that point I would take part in the debate myself if I were to study the enactments to which the minister has referred in order to decide between his contention and the contention put forward by the hon. member for Simcoe East. I do not think the Chair should be placed in that position. I will rule strictly on the point of order, not on the substance of the amendment. For this reason I believe I should accept the amendment.

I would stress again a point which I made before, namely, that if there is any type of amendment on which it is extremely difficult to make a ruling it is these reasoned amendments which are becoming more and more popular in the house and which create constant difficulties for the Chair.

I would suggest to the minister and to hon. members that when there is at least a reasonable doubt in my mind—I am not suggesting