

Medicare

The Chairman: I am sure that members of the committee, including the hon. member for Kamloops, would want to make sure we are following the proper procedure. When the amendment to subclause (f) was proposed I read it to the committee and advised hon. members that if the amendment should carry the committee would be in some difficulty with regard to paragraph (d). This is the position in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. Starr: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, in order that we do not contravene the rules or create any difficulty with regard to a preceding paragraph and an amendment thereto, I point out that it is not the intention of the members of the committee to vote on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe East but rather to receive a ruling from the Chair as to its validity or acceptability, and that is all. Then we could probably revert to the other in order to regularize our procedure.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, in support of what the hon. member for Kamloops has said may I refer you to the very last sentence of that citation:

But if an amendment to the latter part of a clause is withdrawn then it is competent to propose one to an earlier part.

The fact that the words "to propose" are used there makes it self-evident that what was in the mind of the distinguished Speaker who made the ruling in respect of which this citation has been engrossed was that it is a question of the orderly use of motions to amend. In other words, you must start at the beginning and work through a bill clause by clause. Once a motion has been made and is recorded, as is the motion of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, then surely there can be no objection under those circumstances to considering a subsequent amendment, because it cannot in any way disturb the validity or legality of the motion to amend already made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. I think the use of the words "to propose" in the latter part of that citation makes that proposition self-evident.

The Chairman: The Chair is still of the opinion that the proper procedure in this case is to decide what is to be done with the amendment to subclause (d) and then to proceed with the amendment that has been read to the committee, having in mind the admonition of the Chair that there might indeed be some difficulty. According to citation 400 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, the clauses of a

[Mr. Fulton.]

bill in committee of the whole must be considered in their proper order, beginning with clause 1, then taking up clause 2, and so on. I presume that when a clause is divided into different subclauses, as is the case here, the subclauses themselves should be taken up in the proper order. I recognize the procedural difficulty in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that you have some doubt about the amendment now before the committee, I as one member of the committee would suggest that we now revert to paragraph (d). I cannot think of anything less productive than to continue to argue for the rest of the evening about which comes first, the hen or the egg. If the Chair has any doubt about the procedure that has been suggested, may I respectfully urge that we revert to paragraph (d) and to the amendment moved by my leader and have your ruling as to its admissibility.

The Chairman: At this particular point the Chair believes that the proper procedure is to revert to subclause (d).

On subclause (d)—"Insured services".

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, you were good enough to stand subclause (d) at my request and at the request of other members of the committee to give us the opportunity of considering the amendment that had been moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. In the intervening period I have attempted to give some consideration to the regularity of this amendment, especially in light of the preceding rulings rendered by the Chair on earlier similar points.

• (8:40 p.m.)

It is true that this amendment does not immediately impose a financial burden on the crown, because such a burden will occur when action is taken by the Governor in Council to extend services. To that extent no financial burden is involved until action is taken by the Governor in Council. But once that action is taken by the Governor in Council, then one asks, what authority is contained in the royal recommendation to support such financial undertaking?

It seems to me that the Governor in Council is obligated by the terms of the royal recommendation in precisely the same way as a member of the house is obligated in making an amendment. I had attempted to see if in some way this amendment might fit into the four corners of the rules but for the reasons previously stated I have serious misgivings