

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

grams and limiting the increase in any federal government contribution to the increase in the gross national product?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is an element of the proposals. The proposals have a twofold purpose, to halt the escalation in costs and to improve the efficiency of the health delivery system and by so doing respond to the provinces' demand for a greater say in the priorities. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that many of the provinces agree with the federal government that if the present projection in terms of escalation of health costs continues without some governmental action to limit the increase over the next few years, the growth will be so monumental that it might constitute a threat to the whole system we have developed in Canada which I believe is second to none in the world.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to interrupt the minister's statement. We have reached the end of the question period. Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** We have reached the end of the question period. I believe the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State wishes to ask the House to revert to motions?

**Mr. Faulkner:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have unanimous consent to revert to motions for the purpose of tabling the evaluation task force report.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### YOUTH

#### OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH PROGRAM—TABLING OF EVALUATION TASK FORCE REPORT

**Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table copies in French and English of the evaluation task force report.

[Mr. Douglas.]

• (1230)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### FAMILY INCOME SECURITY PLAN

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE BENEFITS IN RESPECT OF CHILDREN

On the order: Government orders:

March 15, 1972—Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs of Bill C-170, An Act to provide for the payment of benefits in respect of children.—The Minister of National Health and Welfare.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope that my point of order will be of interest to Your Honour. I think it will interest the government House leader. My point of order is based on the bill now before the House, Bill C-170. I submit, and this is my point of order, that the motion for second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs of Bill C-170 cannot now be considered. To do so, Mr. Speaker, would violate the long standing rule of the House to the effect that a question, being once put and decided in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as a judgment of the House. I submit that that is the accepted principle governing this House. Explanations of this rule will be found in May's Parliamentary Practice, Seventeenth Edition, at page 396 and following pages and at page 518 and following pages, and in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, page 164, paragraph 194.

That is the procedural rule, Mr. Speaker. When applied to the situation now before the House, we find that the message containing the recommendation of His Excellency informs this House that the bill provides for amendments to the Income Tax Act. Clause 22 of the bill purports to implement this recommendation by amending section 120 of the Income Tax Act. Only a few days ago this House voted on Bill C-169, an act to amend the Income Tax Act. Having passed all stages in the House, Bill C-169 is now before the other place at the second reading stage. The Senate minutes for Thursday, March 23, 1972, under orders of the day, so indicate. Page 77 of the Senate minutes also indicates that on that day the other place adjourned until next Monday at eight o'clock in the evening.

Section 34(2) of the Interpretation Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, Chapter I-23, provides:

An Act may be amended or repealed by an Act passed in the same session of Parliament.

I want to make it clear that we do not oppose the principle of the bill before the House. What we oppose is the change that the government, in our view, has made in the bill. A bill similar to this one was introduced in the last session, I think as Bill C-264, and received first reading on September 13, 1971. Clause 21 or 23 of that bill regarding the repeal of the Family Allowances Act and the implementation of the new act provided that that section shall come into force on the 1st May, 1972. On a number of occasions throughout the previous session members on this side of the House pressed the government to bring forward this bill. There was general agreement in the