

some form of unanimity. But in a matter as important as this, despite the fact that there was a motion of the House passed unanimously, the kind of motion which affords some protection by way of anonymity to those members who are here, the only way we can get anywhere on this is to put some pressure on the government.

● (1630)

If there were a willingness to give unanimous consent to discuss the subject matter, my hon. friend, or someone acting on his behalf, would have to move an amendment, and a debate could take place in the remaining half hour which would smoke out those who might piously indicate that they are in favour of the measure but, that unfortunately, they cannot discuss it because it is out of order. I hope none of them are, in fact, present in the House at this moment. This would give an opportunity for us to reflect and offer the government an indication of our views between now and five o'clock. If unanimous consent is not given, that would, of course, settle the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I thank hon. members for their interest in the problem the House is facing at this time. I am sure they will agree with me that we should deal with first things first and consider the point of order which was raised by the parliamentary secretary before we see if there is unanimous consent to any other action the House might wish to take in the rest of the time available.

The point raised by the parliamentary secretary is well taken, and hon. members need hardly go to the trouble of reminding the Chair of Standing Order 62(1), which is very clear and says:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

The Standing Order is very clear. Hon. members who take the trouble to read some of the material around Citation 265 of *Beauchesne* will find precedents which confirm the application of this Standing Order over the years. It is very difficult for the Chair to overlook this restriction as far as our proceedings are concerned.

Of course the objective and the principle involved in the proposal made by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker) are not questioned at this time. What the Chair is concerned about is whether or not this proposed Bill C-235 has a money implication and whether or not it might impose a financial burden on the public treasury. This is the main point which has been raised by hon. members.

The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) were concerned about the involvement of the Chair, with regard to the point of order raised by the parliamentary secretary. But I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) gave an answer to that when he reminded us that Mr. Speaker did make a reservation when all these bills were presented—that he warned hon. members by entering a caveat that the Chair was reserving its decision as to the acceptability of the hundred or so

measures which were presented to the House all at the same time.

I am, of course, concerned about any legislation which may be of benefit to the population of Canada, and I was hoping that some hon. member might be able to prove to me that there is no money implication in the bill proposed. While hon. members were fighting their way through the procedural points I was trying to see whether or not it was possible for an armed forces veteran to reach the age of 65 and be entitled to old age security before the period of ten years. I was not in a position to establish this, and so as far as I am concerned I still have a doubt in my mind as to whether it is possible for a Canadian, maybe not in peacetime but in wartime, to come out of the armed forces and be eligible for old age security pension by reaching the age of 65, which is in the act at this time. So there is, to my mind, a money implication in this bill.

I myself have been in the chair on two occasions in this House within recent weeks when there was unanimous agreement to consider proposals which had money implications so as not to lose the time available for private members' hour. Although I did make a caveat I did let the House debate such proposals.

But I feel that after giving this warning, and inviting hon. members not to put the Chair too often in this kind of situation, at the same time, in the light of the decision rendered by Mr. Speaker on Bill C-44 this week, which I think gave more importance than ever to the need for a royal recommendation to be attached to a piece of legislation, or to be presented at the same time an amendment is presented either in committee or in this House, at report stage or at any other stage, I feel that if there is to be a recommendation to be attached to this bill because of its money implications, it should be done now. I would be surprised if the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary had such a recommendation available. Because of all these considerations I cannot allow the bill in its present form to be debated at this time.

As far as another suggestion is concerned that there might be unanimous consent to discharge the order and then allow the hon. member to withdraw his bill, can the House then decide to debate the subject matter? I do not see too much difficulty about that. I feel there is no real precedent, but there are a few minutes left before the House adjourns for the weekend, and if there is unanimous consent to debate the subject matter, after we have taken the bill off the order paper, I would have no objection and I would be ready, by unanimous consent, to allow the subject matter to be debated.

Mr. Lefebvre: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could you inform us what you are asking us to do between now and five o'clock? I did not quite get the end of it.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, you would permit the hon. member to withdraw his bill with the understanding that the House would give leave to have the subject matter of the bill discussed during the time remaining.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I made a mistake. I did not realize that the bill had never been in front of the House; so the hon. member cannot withdraw the bill from the House at this time. But let it be ordered that the bill be