

*Borrowing Authority*

Beauchesne cites this decision from the *Journals* of February 17, 1970, and April 23, 1971.

If hon. members read citation 749 on the next page they will find it is more precise and reads as follows:

An amendment to defer second reading of a bill until the subject matter has been considered by a committee is out of order in that it does not oppose the principle of the bill but merely attaches a condition.

To my mind, by proposing that the bill be not now read but that it be read only on a certain condition, such amendment does not indicate to me that it opposes the principle of the bill but merely that it attaches a condition. At the same time, however, the amendment anticipates the committee stage where such a decision could be made. I do not think that the hon. member by his amendment can give that kind of direction to the committee.

This being said, I am ready to hear opinions from hon. members, but I am sure I will have great difficulty in accepting the amendment on the basis I have just stated.

**Mr. McRae:** Mr. Speaker, I should just like to raise one small point. We realize, of course, that this is not a substantive amendment. We did not intend in any way to change the bill. We realize we cannot do that on second reading. We feel that it is very important, however, in a borrowing bill that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) should explain what he is doing. We think at this particular point that the most vital part of the background to this borrowing bill is his appearance first before the committee, so that he can explain the events of the last several months which led to this borrowing bill. It is because he refused to come to the committee before the Governor of the Bank of Canada that we made this motion.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just spoken could well have proposed by way of an amendment what is commonly called, in Beauchesne's terms, a six months' hoist. Now, we have to know who proposed that six months' hoist during the second reading of the bill and its referral to committee?

It seems to me it would have been irresponsible to do so at this time, given the circumstances, because we on this side of the House do not intend to delay the passage of the bill. We do not want at all to prevent the government from having authority to borrow the funds which are needed to administer, except that the hon. member who moved the amendment acted in a much more responsible manner than permitted by the Standing Orders and by the tradition. When he suggested in his amendment that second reading of the bill be deferred until the Minister of Finance finally appears before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, we presumed that the latter would have the courage to do so before six months. But when we heard his answer today, Mr. Speaker, when he said that he would appear before the finance committee when he is in Ottawa, we thought that it did not sound very serious from a government which administers public funds.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

● (2150)

The purpose of this amendment was, on the one hand, to avoid postponing the second reading of this bill to six months from now and, on the other, to show we are responsible people by requiring that before this bill is passed on second reading the Minister of Finance have the decency not to refuse to appear before the finance committee—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I must nevertheless interrupt the hon. member for Drummond (Mr. Pinard). I could have intervened when the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae) was making his remarks. In brief, what he has just said is somehow a continuation of what the hon. member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan suggested, meaning that they are debating the substance of the matter, not the point of procedure before us. I think I do not have to make a ruling on the appearance or non-appearance of the minister before the finance committee at such and such a time, but I must at this time make a ruling as to whether the amendment being proposed by the hon. member is in accordance with the rules and practices of this House. If the hon. member reads certain citations by our authors, he will note that in recent years proposed substantive amendments were more and more intended in their form to postpone passage of a bill for six months. They took that form because it is about the only one allowed in our system. As long as the procedure remains unchanged, I must apply the rules, and if I refer to Beauchesne's citation 744, as I already suggested in English, substantive amendments that must be introduced in the form of a motion may take various forms, and the first one is that they must constitute a declaratory resolution on some principle contrary to those in the bill itself. So the amendment introduced by the hon. member does not run counter to any part of the bill. It quite simply lays down a condition requiring the minister to appear before the committee over which I, as Speaker, do not have jurisdiction, that committee being also able to call the witnesses it wants and organize its work as it wishes. So as far as I am concerned, unless the hon. member for Drummond has other points to make, I would tell him that what he just said does not convince me at all to accept his amendment.

**Mr. Pinard:** Briefly, Mr. Speaker, my argument is as follows: you have quoted from Beauchesne, citation 744, but if we read from the fifth edition, citation 740—

*[English]*

—there are three types of amendments that may be proposed at the second reading stage of a bill. These are, first, the six months' hoist—

*[Translation]*

Precisely as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Nielsen) is saying, that was not a six months' hoist. But my reasoning is as