

Old Age Security Act, it would increase the scope of the act. I remind the House that there is a recent decision right on that point.

Mr. Young: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, as the parliamentary secretary said, that it is not open to a private member to propose a bill which increases the amount of money to be spent under a law of this country. Otherwise, for example, it would be open for a private member to propose a bill which would double pensions paid to senior citizens. I think that was the parliamentary secretary's point. I submit that money bills must be preceded by the royal recommendation. Of course if the number of senior citizens in the country were doubled or if the age of eligibility were altered, more money would be paid out of the national treasury. I think the point made by the parliamentary secretary is valid.

Mr. Poulin: Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker) for bringing forward this bill. I think it makes a major suggestion which ought to be considered at the proper time, in the proper way. The parliamentary secretary has defined the position. If this bill passes it will become a charge on the treasury of this country. Such a charge can only be proposed by the treasury benches, as the recent decision of Mr. Speaker makes clear.

We, on my side, are most interested in seeing that all senior citizens who would be included in the new classification are given the benefits to which they are entitled, but we know this must be done within the rules established by parliament. In my view this bill is out of order, for the reasons given by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Miss Campbell).

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, listening to the last speaker say how great the bill is almost brought tears to my eyes. The hon. member opposite suggested that this bill would add to the provisions of the Old Age Security Act and that this could only be done at the proper time, in the proper way. I suggest that the proposal of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker) would not add any new money to be spent on people in this country. There is already in existence a law under which we pay old age pensioners money they so well deserve. Certainly this bill would provide pensions for some people who fought for their country. There is something wrong with a government which will not agree to passing, in less than an hour, a bill which will provide benefits for people who fought for this country and made it great. There is something wrong with a government which challenges this kind of bill. After all, Mr. Speaker must have seen it and agreed to its inclusion on the order paper, or it would not be in the list of bills on the order paper.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, certainly members do not intend to discredit the idea behind the hon. member's bill. I think the parliamentary secretary, however, wisely pointed out that a bill involving the expenditure of funds is beyond the realm of a private member.

I sincerely compliment the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds) who spoke so eloquently about senior citizens. Nevertheless, no matter how worthwhile the bill is, it must conform to the rules. I am afraid I

Old Age Security Act

agree with the parliamentary secretary. This bill does not fall within the prerogative of private members.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the points of order raised in connection with Bill C-235. Like my colleague for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Reynolds), I listened with amazement at some of the remarks from across the way. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) made, as he does from time to time, a logical and constructive contribution to this House. Apparently there is some procedural difficulty with Bill C-235, even though it has cleared the hurdle of the Table. Surely remarks like that constitute a vicarious insult to Table officers, and to those responsible for seeing the bill placed on the order paper. Members of the government have been standing up and saying that they are in sympathy with the subject matter of the bill. The eye which looks at the bill that way has a tear in it. But the other eye, with its narrower vision, sees some misty, hazy, procedural objection, which will deny to senior citizens who are or should be qualified benefits for which they fought so hard.

I was surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Miss Campbell), the parliamentary secretary. I know of her interest in certain problems affecting the health and welfare of Canadians at large and, it is to be hoped, of her own constituents. I was absolutely amazed to hear what she said, in view of her interest shown in the people of South Western Nova before she became a member, and that she would be a party—

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have listened for long enough to comments against my constituency in connection with this matter. It should be remembered that this proposed provision may apply to a few Canadians only, and not, as the hon. member suggests, to my constituency.

● (1620)

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this because I am going to come up with what I think will be a very constructive, healthy compromise to resolve the dilemma. The fact is that the subject matter of the bill in effect gives credit to those who fought outside the country for their pension entitlement. I would think that with the humane interest of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Miss Campbell) as a member, she would find support for that proposition, but unfortunately, donning the cloaks and robes of parliamentary secretary, she has to look at it from another point of view. I know this means running counter to her fundamental interest.

In order to resolve these problems and wash away the crocodile tears so that people can have clear vision, I do not see why this House, because of the fundamental interest in the humanity of the bill, cannot by unanimous consent refer the subject matter of the bill to the appropriate committee for due deliberation, in order that we do not run into any narrow procedural rule which would put this on the side tracks.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) has raised a very interesting point. We have