

Old Age Security Act

take too much time, is based on a study of Standing Order 62(1) and citation 244 (3) in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, which reads as follows:

Amendments proposing, in a Money Resolution, to substitute a loan for a subsidy; to change the destination, purpose and conditions of a subsidy; attaching a condition to a subsidy; affecting the ends and provisions of a subsidy, must be moved by a Minister with the recommendation of the Crown.

Again, in citation 246(3) of Beauchesne the same point is made. While I can certainly understand the purposes for which the hon. members have put down these motions, I do believe that they go far beyond the royal recommendation and therefore cannot be received by the House at this time.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I would like to ask whether the parliamentary secretary is referring to motion No. 1, or is he considering all five amendments? In looking over the amendments, I find that they do not all fit into the same category and therefore, his argument probably applies only to the first one. Is he prepared to extend the same argument to the other amendments? Perhaps he could clarify his position.

Mr. Reid: I will be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker. I think a careful reading of each of the five notices of motion would indicate that their effect would be to increase the amount of money which the Crown would have to expend on these particular programs. On that basis, an increase in the amount of money to be expended would violate the terms of the royal recommendation and, therefore, would not be receivable by the House. I am prepared to argue each one separately, if you wish, but it does seem to me that the same argument is applicable to all five of the notices of motions.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to discuss the point of order raised by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. (Mr. Reid)?

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss notice of motion No. 1 under the name of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) and which reads as follows:

That Bill C-147, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act be amended by deleting the words "one hundred dollars" from Clause 1 at line 9 and substituting therefor the words "two hundred dollars".

Mr. Speaker, in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons governing us and that we wish to follow as closely as possible, although it may sometimes hinder us in our work as members of the House when we want to be effective and consistent with the desires of the people we represent, Standing Order 75 (5) reads as follows:

(5) If, not later than twenty-four hours prior to the consideration of a report stage, written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

Consequently, notice of motion No. 1 complies with the practice provided for Standing Order 75 (5) as it was given

[Mr. Reid.]

as required by the standing order. Therefore, the amendment can be declared receivable.

I will now refer to Standing Order 75(8) which is extremely important and which states the following:

When the Order of the Day for the consideration of a report stage is called,

—exactly as in the present situation—

—any amendment

—not only a few—

—of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

Standing Order 75(8) is extremely important because it does not establish a category, as the hon. parliamentary secretary seemed to say, concerning money or other motions. It reads and I quote:

—any amendment—

—to a bill, at the report stage—

—of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

Finally I shall quote section (10) of the same order concerning the power of the Speaker as regards amendments at the report stage. We shall see that under section (10) the Speaker has some latitude when ruling on the admissibility of amendments, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment as may enable Mr. Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

It is exactly what the Chair, allows us to do now that is to plead in favour of this motion which aims at increasing the basic amount of the old age pension from \$100 to \$200 and, Mr. Speaker, we are grateful for it.

On the other hand, I remind the Chair of its power to select or combine the proposed amendments so as to enable the House to examine these proposals in order that the debate can be more profound, serious and in accordance with the wishes of people. So I think that these references, and particularly section (8), according to which any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment, establish that the notice of motion of the hon. member for Abitibi is in order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I thank hon. members for the comments they have so willingly—
[*English*]

Mr. Peters: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to make a ruling on these separately, and not in bulk.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. To pursue what I was saying, hon. members may comment, but it is up to the Chair to make a decision. I do not think that one can ask the Chair to make the same decision on every motion. We have to follow the rule of relevancy in this House and at the same time we invite members not to be repetitive. In this case, it may be that the Chair would not have to repeat itself. I have had the opportunity over the past two days to look at the motions that have been