

Medicare

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you with respect that that part of the citation which you read is as follows:

Amendments must be made in the order of the lines of a clause. If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause.

I have read this section of the citation to show that it is not applicable in this case. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has already proposed an amendment to subclause (d) and the committee stood the subclause with the amendment. Since the amendment has already been moved, in my submission it would not be prejudiced by our action in dealing conclusively with the amendment proposed to subclause (f). In other words, this portion of the citation is not applicable to the present situation. We certainly do not wish to prejudice in any way the consideration of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam nor do we wish to create confusion in the committee's proceedings, but it does seem to me that the two subclauses can be disposed of on their separate merits. Therefore we would like to urge that the committee proceed with the discussion of the amendment with respect to subclause (f).

Mr. Lewis: Has the Chair ruled on the point of order?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, the matter before the committee is the point of order which I raised with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe East. The next logical step is to determine whether or not the amendment is to be put to the committee. If that decision were made we would then know how to proceed, because if it is not to be put to the committee then the objection which might otherwise stand in the way would be removed. On the other hand, if it is to be put to the committee we can reach a decision at that time.

● (8:30 p.m.)

The Chairman: Order. Is it the wish of the committee that we now revert to subclause (d) and to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I made the request, and I have not heard a counter request, that we proceed to deal with the amendment moved to paragraph (f).

Mr. Starr: We would like a ruling on the amendment.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, might I make a comment on the opinion expressed by the Chair a moment ago, namely, that citation 397 stands in the way of our dealing now with the amendment to paragraph (f). With respect, I submit that we would be in difficulty if we passed an amendment to paragraph (f) so far as going back to paragraph (d) is concerned, but I see no problem in having a ruling on the admissibility or otherwise of the amendment to paragraph (f) and continuing to discuss that paragraph. If the amendment is in order and we vote on it and amend paragraph (f), then we are in some trouble, but let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us find out first of all whether the proposed amendment is in order.

Mr. Lewis: May we have a ruling now?

The Chairman: I recognize the argument presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, but let me read again part of citation 397 in Beauchesne's fourth edition:

If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause.

I think the committee will recall that when the amendment was moved to paragraph (f) I did mention to the committee that the procedure we were adopting then might indeed become somewhat irregular. The citation says:

If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause.

Are there any further comments on this question?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether you were in the chair when I made the observation that the citation you have read refers to the competency of a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause. I pointed out that the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam had already moved his amendment and all that happened was that his amendment together with paragraph (d) was stood. It has been regularly moved and is before the committee.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this portion of the citation is not applicable to the situation in which we find ourselves. I submit it is competent for the committee to deal with paragraph (f) and the amendment moved thereto without prejudice to an amendment already moved to paragraph (d), which paragraph stood. Therefore I make the request that we deal with paragraph (f) and the amendment thereto.