

test, or a needs test, or requiring any disclosure of income or financial resources.”

And a point of order having been raised;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to honourable Members for the learned advice they have given the Chair and for their comments. I may say, however, that I am perhaps a little more confused now than I was 45 minutes ago when the discussion started.

When the points were raised originally I was under the impression that there was a more important obstacle or objection to the motion moved by the honourable Member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Winkler) because there had been a disposition of at least one aspect of this matter during the course of the current session.

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) disposed of this objection at least to some extent by pointing out that we have dealt with eligibility in respect of age and quantum of pensions and that this particular amendment would deal with the application of some kind of test. This is a valid argument which I might be prepared to accept. In any event I feel I should not rule on this point because it is in my opinion easier to rule on the second point.

I wish I were as sure of the opinion I am going to express now as the Right Honourable Leader of the Opposition was when he argued in support of this amendment. The objection I have in mind is the one brought to my attention by the honourable Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) regarding the rule of anticipation which is referred to in citation 234(1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition. This has been referred to and quoted by honourable Members so I will not read it again. It is as well known to honourable Members as it is to me.

The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre presented a very interesting argument when he claimed that perhaps this rule of anticipation is limited in its application and does not apply unless a certain stage has been reached in respect of a particular case. For my guidance he quoted a decision in which he had been involved in his capacity as a Member of Parliament. This was a ruling of the then Speaker of the House.

It seems there is a distinction in this regard because that ruling dealt with the case of two bills. The essence of the ruling of the then Speaker was to the effect that there is nothing in the rules which would prevent two or more similar bills being on the Order Paper at the same time and only one of them being discussed. In other words, one cannot raise the objection that a bill cannot be discussed because there is a similar bill on the Order Paper. The purport of the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener was that if no decision had been taken on one bill it was open to the House to discuss the other which happened to be before the House at the time. I am sure the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre will agree that there is a distinction between the two situations.

The reference to citation 131 by the honourable Minister of National Health and Welfare is very important. It is my belief that citation 234 should be read along with citation 131 and I will bring it again to the attention of honourable Members. Citation 131 reads in part as follows: “In applying the anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which lead to the most effective result, and this has established a descending scale of values