

*Health Insurance*

When my hon. friend first introduced the amendment—

**Mr. Knowles:** Read citation 709, too.

**Mr. Martin:** Just a moment, please. When my hon. friend introduced the amendment he did not take into account the full implications of citation 708. It was only through a later suggestion of considerable ingenuity that he suddenly realized he could possibly bring himself in order—of course this is my interpretation—if he proposed an alteration to his own amendment so as to bring it within the meaning of the words in citation 708, "For the purpose of amending it in any particular." This was the purpose of the change which he himself suggested that Your Honour might make to his original wording. It is clear that 708 is subject to 437 in Beauchesne and the pertinent section which says that no money bill can be introduced except on the initiative of a minister of the crown.

**Mr. Knowles:** My amendment is not introducing a bill. You said it is clear and it is not.

**Mr. Martin:** Citation 708, I repeat, must be relative to 437 and those other pertinent decisions and sections that provide that no money bill in any form may be introduced other than by a minister of the crown. Now, if 708 meant what my hon. friend says it means the result would be that when a bill comes up for third reading a private member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for considering it for any kind of purpose whatsoever, to amend it in any particular the member may wish. But citation 708 is obviously limited, in that the particular amendment to which it refers may not be an amendment that violates 437 or 440 of the rules. So I say that it is clear that you cannot refer a matter back to the committee except for a particular purpose, and the only purpose that my hon. friend has in mind is that we should reconsider our decision to spend money at a time and under a contingency not covered by this bill or envisaged by the crown.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare seems to think that the only purpose of going back into committee would be to do something that would have an operative effect. I admit that it would be my desire that we might achieve an operative effect, but surely the minister will admit that in parliament there is a purpose in discussion and a purpose in consideration. He tries to convince us of his views. What we seek is a chance

[Mr. Martin.]

to persuade the government that a change should be made. As a private member I cannot move an operative motion involving the expenditure of money, but as a private member I do have the right to move motions asking for consideration and I suggest to the Minister of National Health and Welfare there is all the difference in the world between 708, which talks about going back to the committee for reconsideration of a bill, and 437 which talks about the initial introduction of a bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** It must be very clear to all hon. members that when I said that the amendment, if it were carried, may not serve any useful purpose, I was echoing the words and the reasoning of Mr. Speaker Macdonald; he did go along with the reasoning of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on March 5, 1952 as it appears on page 23 of the *Journals*. However, on page 27, the next day, he rose and said:

Since that time I have given further consideration to the amendment and although it may have been technically in order I am rather doubtful of the practical result which would have followed if it had carried. The committee would have reconsidered an amendment which would have necessitated an expenditure of money. But the committee could not have taken any action on the matter without a motion by a member of the government. The government had intimated that it would not propose such an amendment. Accordingly I am doubtful if any useful purpose would have been served by referring the matter back to the committee. The purpose of this statement is to advise the house that, for the reason which I have stated and for other reasons, should a similar amendment be moved on any future occasion, I would not feel myself bound by the ruling which I made yesterday.

I was merely repeating this and this is the reason why I have been troubled about this amendment from the very start. If it were not for this ruling of Mr. Speaker Macdonald I would have said nothing about this amendment. However, why did Mr. Speaker Macdonald, after having made the statement which he did on an amendment of a similar nature at page 23, feel that it was his duty at page 27 on the next day to make the further remarks which I have just read to the house?

Therefore I have been examining and re-examining the point and the conclusion to which I have come is that on a matter of this kind you can just as easily go either way. I could take the reasoning of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and say that is good enough for me and make a ruling along that line. On the other hand, I could take the reasoning of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, because that would be just as good. I could find decisions both ways more or less on a half and half basis. Because of all the difficulties involved