

*National Housing Act*

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Reid: You were doing well up until now.

Mr. Basford: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, for the government to lend money at the same rate as it borrows it, with all the administrative costs involved, is a charge on the public purse. The only persons who can move an amendment imposing a charge on the public purse are ministers of the Crown, and even then the royal recommendation is required. For these reasons I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is out of order.

● (2100)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. gentleman suggests that the amendment by my hon. friend from Oshawa-Whitby is out of order because it would involve public expenditure. How, then, does he find it possible to accept the amendment by the hon. member for Calgary North which also involves public expenditure?

Mr. Basford: Because, Mr. Speaker, the corporation's administrative cost is less than one half of 1 per cent.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am speaking now is to express amazement at the zero argument put forward by the minister. It seems to me that for a gentleman who before he came to this House was learned in the law, it was one of the most empty, absurd and bankrupt arguments one could imagine, to understate the case. He says we cannot deal with this now as a new amendment because it was dealt with by the Speaker earlier in the day. But the matter dealt with by the Speaker earlier in the day was a totally different matter. It involved the question whether amendment No. 3 should be voted on or dealt with ahead of motion No. 4. The Speaker, ruled, purely on the basis of priority, that No. 3 came before No. 4, and we did not quarrel with that reasoning.

However, my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre made it crystal clear that this amendment is a totally different proposition. How could the Speaker have ruled on it when the question was in no way before him? It is elementary in judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings that decisions must be based on material which is before the person who makes them. Here we are in a totally different situation.

One wonders as to the hon. gentleman's reason for supporting the argument that this amendment is out of order. He says notice is required. However, the rules make no such demand, as my hon. friend made clear. I do not understand why the minister should try to warp the rules in this fashion.

Mr. Morgan: Mr. Speaker, after listening to what has been said by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), I understand why the whip said the chamber was full of second-class lawyers who couldn't hack their own profession.

Some hon. Members: Oh!

An hon. Member: Cheap!

Mr. Morgan: The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) is trying to get in by the back door what he

[Mr. Basford.]

could not get in by the front door. He cannot mix procedure with substance, as he is obviously trying to do. The question is *res judicata*; it was dealt with this afternoon by the Speaker. All the hon. members in that corner are trying to do is abort Standing Order 75(5) and bring in through a procedural method what they could not bring in substantively. If they find themselves on the horns of a dilemma, they can blame themselves.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret I must ask the hon. member to come to the point. The Chair would not wish him to get into an argument with other hon. members who, after all, have a right to seek to present amendments to the House. I do not think that passing judgment or reflecting on the reasons why amendments have been proposed is likely to help the Chair.

Mr. Morgan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point is that the amendment is seeking to do procedurally what could not be done substantively. The matter is clearly *res judicata*, having been dealt with by the Speaker this afternoon. I believe Standing Order 75(5) is quite conclusive. Acceptance of any amendment of this type would make the rules ludicrous. The amendment cannot be accepted and it must be ruled out of order as not being possible at this time.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt of the hon. member's right to propose an amendment to the amendment at this time. Standing Order 75(8) makes this clear. However, it does seem to me to be out of order for the hon. member, having given notice of a motion under 75(5), to bundle it in with another amendment we are debating. If the hon. member succeeds in what he is trying to do, his main amendment will come up for discussion twice, once as a subamendment and the second time as amendment No. 4. I would argue that having given notice of his motion under Standing Order 75(5), it is not competent for him to move the amendment as a subamendment.

As to the procedural acceptability of the amendment, or in this case the subamendment, my hon. friend the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Basford) has pointed out that it is out of order since it is not accompanied by the royal recommendation despite the fact that it involves public expenditure by way of a cost incurred in collection, administration and disbursement. So the amendment is out of order on both those grounds.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, the argument by the parliamentary secretary that the amendment to the amendment is out of order because it involves public expense and lacks the royal recommendation, amendments involving public expenditure being a Crown prerogative, is a specious one in the sense that everything done in this House involves expenditure. This particular amendment to the amendment, and amendment No. 4, will not occasion any visible expenditure other than in the cost of the administration of the National Housing Act, an act which must be administered in any event. That is not an argument for ruling the amendment out of order. What is really happening here is an exercise in gamesmanship. The hon. member, by moving the amendment to the amendment, is trying to do twice what he has already attempted to do once in amendments 4, 6, and so on. This matter, in terms