

The honourable Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) having raised a point of order to the effect that the proposed amendment was irregular in that it did not present any policy or provision contrary to the bill and was, in part, not relevant to the provisions of the bill.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for their sound and sage advice relative to the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) and seconded by the honourable Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). The amendment, as has been mentioned by honourable Members who took part in the discussion, claims to be a reasoned amendment and as such must be judged by the principles which have been mentioned in the House previously on numerous occasions, particularly on August 30. At that time, when a reasoned amendment was proposed by the right honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), I expressed my views on the principles which must govern the acceptance of reasoned amendments. These principles are set out chiefly in May's seventeenth edition, page 527. This citation gives three different categories within which an amendment should fall. These are alternative categories within which the proposed amendment should fall.

As I have explained, if a reasoned amendment is not acceptable by virtue of the fact that it does not fall within the first of these categories, it can still be acceptable if it falls within the second or third category enumerated in May's seventeenth edition. This is the point which was made by the honourable Member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and I am in full agreement with him. Even though the amendment is not declaratory of a principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policies or provisions of the bill, it can still be accepted if it falls within either of the other two categories.

I find on this ground that I cannot accept the objection raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) who raised the very important question of relevancy. This, of course, is a very serious objection inasmuch as the rule provides that all amendments, even reasoned amendments, are subject to the rule of relevancy. The requirement is that an amendment should be strictly relevant.

I have look at paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the proposed motion, and looking at them objectively they certainly appear to me to be relevant to the bill. The claim made by the Minister was that paragraphs (c) and (d) are not strictly relevant inasmuch as at least one of these two is dealt with by the estimates of the Department of Industry. I would suggest to him that that is not sufficient reason to decide that the matter is not strictly relevant to the principle of the bill before us.

He also stated that paragraphs (c) and (d) are dealt with by other legislative amendments or proposals. On the other hand, I take it that if the honourable Member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) promotes the acceptance of these principles, it must be because he feels that they are not included in other legislative proposals. I think that the word "adequate" which is used in paragraph (c) is particularly important. The honourable Member for Simcoe East may feel that some provision has been made for medical research, training adequate numbers of doctors and other medical personnel; but according to this amendment he is suggesting that these provisions are not adequate.

I would think it is a matter for argument whether the proposals made by the honourable Member for Simcoe East are or are not included in other legislative proposals or enactments. I would have to study these enactments to express an opinion. At that point I would take part in the debate myself if I were to study the enactments to which the Minister has referred in order