

*Point of Order*

That the motion be amended by deleting the period and adding the following:

— and implemented by the actions of the NDP premiers of Ontario, Saskatchewan and British Columbia to close health care centres, dismiss health care personnel, reduce health care services, all of which is a direct, inevitable result of the withdrawal of the federal government from its long-standing obligations to support health care in Canada.

Standing Order 81, subsection (11) says:

Opposition motions on allotted days may be moved only by Members in opposition to the government and may relate to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada and also may be used for the purposes of considering reports from standing committees relating to the consideration of estimates therein.

I suggest that this particular Standing Order 81(11) is as wide as possible but it would prevent an allotted day on a purely provincial matter such as rural drainage, municipal infrastructure or anything of that nature.

However, in our system of complex intergovernmental relations, particularly on the subject of health care, where there is assured jurisdiction both provincially and federally, I would think that for the purposes of Standing Order 81(11), any motion put under this standing order must fall inherently within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Any matter that does not fall within the federal jurisdiction cannot, under this standing order, be put to the House.

If Your Honour reads the amendment, it refers, of course, to provincial jurisdictions. I make no mistake of that. But it also refers very clearly and unequivocally to the withdrawal of the federal government from its long-standing obligations to support health care in Canada.

Just because the withdrawal of federal government is nowhere mentioned in the main motion but is mentioned in the amendment, should not preclude us as an opposition party from submitting that amendment.

I would suggest that if logic is to follow and Your Honour were to find, based on the grounds that this particular amendment is beyond the scope of Standing Order 81(11) because it is not within the federal jurisdiction, you would logically have to find that the motion

itself is inadmissible. Therefore, the main motion would be ruled out of order.

I think that in the fitness of time, so to speak, when the Chair looks at the amendment and looks at the main motion you will see quite clearly that the subject matter we are debating is in perfect order. It is in keeping with the main motion with the exception of the words “withdrawing of federal government support”.

I suggest that after a close examination of Standing Order 81(11), if one were to include the words “federal government” it is quite appropriate, thereby making the amendment an appropriate amendment in which this House should have the opportunity to give an adjudication whatever their beliefs may be.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think I should give the House notice. This matter was very thoroughly debated this morning. Out of courtesy, because I was not in the chair and I will have to make the ruling, I have indicated that I would hear further argument briefly.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I will make my comments very brief. I appreciate that we did have a discussion earlier on the appropriateness of the amendment. I want to make two points to my hon. friend, the government House leader who made a valiant effort to suggest it ought to be in order.

When the Chair looks at the amendment it refers specifically to New Democrat provincial governments. The main motion refers explicitly to Liberal governments. Under the rule of relevancy, Mr. Speaker, if you were to support the amendment, the discussion and debate in the House would have to be focused on the amendment exclusively. In other words, the discussion would have to focus around the activities of New Democrat provincial governments, which would be in direct contradiction to the thrust of the motion.

• (1520)

Mr. Speaker, obviously in your position, the rule of relevancy is enforced and I know my hon. friend, who is going to replace you shortly, always enforces the rule of relevancy. It would be impossible to do that under the amendment being proposed by my hon. friend.