

Health Insurance

I have read the discussion which took place on an amendment in committee of the whole. I read the whole argument presented by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) as it appears at pages 2662 and 2663 of *Hansard*, which had to do with the amendment in committee, in much the same terms as that which is being proposed now. Although I did not find the reference, I am told a similar amendment was moved at the resolution stage.

Mr. Martin: The reference at page 2662 is to a further amendment that was offered by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Blair) to qualify an earlier amendment that had been moved several hours earlier.

Mr. Speaker: I saw the amendment that was sent to the Chair in substitution for another one, but I did not go back to the earlier one. I read the debate which took place at the time, and the citations referred to in Beauchesne's third edition and May have particular application today. What troubles me is that Mr. Speaker Macdonald confronted with a similar situation was, as I confess I was until I saw his changed opinion, inclined to allow the amendment. However the next day he felt he ought to warn the house that should a similar amendment be offered in the future, and I consider this is quite similar, he would declare it out of order.

I have been examining this thing very closely. The resolution that was introduced disclosed the fundamental terms, together with His Excellency's recommendation. A resolution preceding a money bill is part of the introduction of the bill, and it attaches to the bill throughout the various stages, which are merely various stages offered for reconsideration.

The argument of the hon. member for Eglinton in committee of the whole was that no particular money is being voted now; that it will have to be provided for by parliament later through an estimate. At page 732 of May's 15th edition May deals with that type of expenditure. He says:

The most frequent case of expenditure of this type is that of charges upon moneys to be provided by parliament for salaries and other expenses caused by the imposition of novel duties upon the executive government by the legislation of the session.

At the top of the page he says:

The effective imposition of a charge has been extended by an amendment of standing order No. 78 to include the imposition of charges upon "money to be provided by parliament" which before 1866 had been excluded, probably on the ground that it implied no immediate charge but only authorized the presentation of estimates.

I was discussing this particular matter with the Clerk because I know that in certain

instances we are 100 years or 150 years behind the United Kingdom in our practice; but he tells me that although we have no standing order such as they have in the United Kingdom dealing with this very matter, we are following the practice which prevails in the United Kingdom and that a bill in which moneys are contemplated to be provided later by parliament through an estimate is considered here and has been for many years a money bill preceded by a money resolution.

The point which troubles me is a term in the money resolution which was preliminary to the introduction of this bill. The words "to commence when at least six provinces" are part of the fundamental terms of the resolution. Citation 440 of Beauchesne's third edition reads:

The fundamental terms of a money resolution submitted to the house with the Governor General's recommendation upon which a committee of the whole is set up cannot be amended. Amendments will only be in order if they fall within the terms of the resolution. The procedure in committee on those resolutions follows in principle the procedure of the committee of supply, and amendments are out of order if they are proposed with a view to substituting an alternative scheme to that proposed with the royal recommendation.

Some hon. members may claim that the way the amendment is worded it is in the abstract form. The amendment reads:

. . . that it be referred back to the committee of the whole house for the purpose of reconsidering . . .

The words "for the purpose of reconsidering" are tantamount to instructions to reconsider the requirement. What would be the use just to send it back to the committee of the whole and just say, "We do not want to do anything effectively with this; we just want to reconsider it". If, after having done so, the minister says that he does not want to make any alteration, then what? And he could not do so unless he received another recommendation from His Excellency the Governor General. Even if he did not need a new recommendation, I take it that since the amendment was moved in committee of the whole his pronouncement was to the effect, as I read it in the record, that he was opposed to changing the scheme. I have read the regrets expressed by Mr. Speaker Macdonald on Wednesday, March 5, when he allowed the amendment and warned the house that he would not feel bound by the ruling that he had given. That took place on Thursday, March 6, as it appears in the *Journals* of that day at page 27. I am very much impressed by the warning of Mr. Speaker Macdonald.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation of your deferring your ruling