

Old Age Security

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre presented a very interesting argument when he claimed that perhaps this rule of anticipation is limited in its application and does not apply unless a certain stage has been reached in respect of a particular case. For my guidance he quoted a decision in which he had been involved in his capacity as member of parliament. This was a ruling of the then Speaker of the house.

It seems there is a distinction in this regard because that ruling dealt with the case of two bills. The essence of the ruling of the then Speaker was to the effect that there is nothing in the rules which would prevent two or more similar bills being on the order paper at the same time and only one of them being discussed. In other words, one cannot raise the objection that a bill cannot be discussed because there is a similar bill on the order paper. The purport of the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener was that if no decision had been taken on one bill, it was open to the house to discuss the other which happened to be before the house at the time. I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will agree that there is a distinction between the two situations.

The reference to citation 131 by the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare is very important. It is my belief that citation 234 should be read along with citation 131 and I will bring it again to the attention of hon. members. Citation 131 reads in part as follows:

In applying the anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which lead to the most effective result, and this has established a descending scale of values for discussions—bills, motions, amendments, etc. Thus a bill must not be anticipated by . . . discussion of a motion, amendment, or subject raised an another motion.

There is a precedent which I suggest to hon. members is analogous or close to the situation we have at hand. I refer to a ruling of a Speaker as reported in the *Journals* of the House of Commons for 1955 at page 120. The Speaker reminded the house of the rule of anticipation and said:

In applying the anticipation rule preference is given to the discussion which leads to the most effective result, and this has established a descending scale of values for discussions—bills, motions, amendments, etc.

In other words, in my view there is a motion on the order paper proposed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Hon. members have argued, and perhaps there is some merit to this argument, that there is

[Mr. Speaker.]

some distinction between the two. However, in my mind it is basically the same subject matter and the same proposal.

What the hon. member for Grey-Bruce is now proposing is that we should decide by way of an amendment what might be decided later when the house enters a discussion of a motion of the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare. It has been suggested that by refusing this amendment we would preclude any possibility for discussing the proposal advanced by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce. I suppose, with some ingenuity, an amendment could be moved on second reading of the bill which will follow the motion introduced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Mr. Knowles: Is that an invitation?

Mr. Speaker: I have not made that decision. I used cautious words. I said that perhaps with ingenuity this could be done, and members have shown a great deal of ingenuity and imagination in recent months in proposing amendments. It has been almost impossible to rule on these ingenious amendments.

I say by way of parenthesis that there will be other opportunities to discuss, consider and decide the very point raised by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce in his amendment. I realize how important this matter is to that hon. member who has been an advocate of the proposal outlined in his amendment. I know how anxious hon. members are to consider this problem, but unless there is unanimous agreement in the house to go ahead with that discussion I think it is not open to the Chair to accept this amendment. Because of the procedural obstacles which I see to the amendment, I regret very much that the Chair cannot accept it.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask for the unanimous consent of the house to proceed with a consideration of this motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has heard negative replies. I regret again that I cannot accept the amendment.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, since Your Honour was not prepared to accept the motion moved by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler), I understand it is now open to the house to deal with some other matters. A supply motion