

No. 16

# JOURNALS

OF THE

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1974

2.00 o'clock p.m.

### PRAYERS

Mr. Gillespie, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, laid upon the Table,—Copies of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles, dated December 20, 1973. (English and French).—Sessional Paper No. 292-6/11.

The item "Introduction of Bills" having been called under "Daily Routine of Business", the notice standing in the name of the honourable Member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) for leave to introduce a Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Canada Student Loans Act";

### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to refer now to the first of the three Bills which stands in the name of the honourable Member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), that is the one which the honourable Member referred to yesterday when he proposed a measure to amend the Canada Student Loans Act. When the Bill was called yesterday the honourable Member provided some assistance to the Chair in relation to the procedural acceptability of the Bill. The Chair is very grateful to the honourable Member for the proffered assistance and since

then very careful consideration has been given to his submission. But even after taking into account the honourable Member's argument it does seem to the Chair that the Bill proposed by him would create a new and a direct charge upon the treasury.

The honourable Member suggests that additional money will not be required since sufficient funds have been provided for this purpose in the statutory vote created pursuant to the parent Act in 1964. That, of course, is a very interesting argument, which gave me cause to ponder and reflect. It was after, as I said, serious reflection that I saw the flaw in the honourable Member's argument.

The Chair appreciates that the recommendation which accompanied the parent Statute in 1964 was stated in general terms and might not have precluded on that occasion an amendment such as that which is now being proposed.

I do not think that it can be contended that a financial proposal that might have been permissible as an amendment in 1964 when the original parent Statute was introduced can now be put forward under the provisions of a recommendation which had effect only in relation to the initial student loans plan.