

*Medicare*

This is the one which appears on page 510 of May's 13th edition.

—and, in my view, applies more directly to proceedings in the committee stage on the resolution than to proceedings on the committee stage of the bill.

With the greatest respect I should like to read again the exact words from page 510 of May's 13th edition. May says:

As the resolution sanctions, without any specific limitation, the application of money to be provided by parliament to certain purposes, when the clauses in a bill founded upon such a resolution are before the committee—

That is, the committee of the whole on the bill:

—the freedom of action sanctioned by that resolution can be exercised.

The reference is as clear as it can be. It is to the committee of the whole on the bill. The quotation continues.

The committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers of the crown have inserted in the bill, and any member may propose to increase the grants specified in these clauses or to extend the application of the provisions of the bill, whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

I hardly need to read again the terms of the resolution preceding this bill, because they have been put on record a good many times. Certainly, no one can dispute the statement that there is no financial or monetary ceiling imposed by the resolution. I suggest, therefore, that whatever else might be found defective in the hon. gentleman's amendment we surely cannot lose this right as spelled out in May's 13th edition. The government can prevent us any time it chooses from moving amendments of this kind to any given bill—and it often does so—by putting a ceiling in the resolution. But when the government does not put a ceiling in the resolution, it cannot be argued that we are unable to move amendments because they involve additional expenditure.

As to the object and purpose of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard), I think this aspect is covered by the generality and vagueness of the resolution preceding the bill. In other words, I am making it clear, without arguing the substance or the desirability of these things, that we are in favour of this amendment and think it should be allowed.

Despite all that has been said in the last hour and a half, I recognize that Your Honour is not called upon to consider what might be desirable, or what might be good legislation,

or legislation which the people of Canada might desire. Your Honour has to look at the procedural aspects of this matter. Throughout the seven debates on procedure we have had, two questions have been before us. Are we exceeding the objects and purposes of the resolution? That is a matter of judgment and you, sir, must make that decision. Are we exceeding the amount of money contemplated? Since there was no amount of money stipulated in the resolution, I insist, on the basis of what is said in May's 13th edition and elsewhere, that in these circumstances we have the right to move amendments of this kind. I am happy, therefore, to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe East. Perhaps I have also had the honour of doing what Your Honour would like to be done, namely, closing the debate on the procedural issue.

● (5:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** As I was listening to hon. members make these comments I could not but come to the conclusion that many of them could have rendered a much more judicious decision than I could reach myself, although I am afraid that most of these hon. members would have reached a decision which would have been different to that which I propose to render. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) was kind enough to refer to the fact that I am here in the position of a member of the court of appeal. I can tell him that I would be prepared right now to be sent back to the trial division.

I must say I am not over enthusiastic about the new rule which puts the Speaker in a position where he has to either agree or disagree with the Deputy Speaker, other than behind the curtains or in the Speaker's chambers. I have to take my responsibility, and I certainly will look at the situation very objectively.

As I indicated at the outset I have followed the debate during the last few days even though it has taken place in committee. I know the importance of the subject and I know the clash which exists between the two points of view. I know it is not easy to reconcile one fact with the other. The point which is under consideration now is a very limited one and is strictly procedural. The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) has been very helpful to the Chair. In his comments he said we should be limited strictly to the procedural question. The question is not whether we should have the definition proposed in the amendment moved by the hon. member for