

means that every one of us is utterly paralyzed and that only the hon. members of the Cabinet would have a right to do something in Parliament.

My second argument, Mr. Speaker, is that it is perfectly possible for us to approve our amendments and lower the eligibility age for the old age security pension to 60, or grant it automatically to the spouse, without necessarily upsetting the budget. One would merely have to find a way of saving somewhere and balancing it. It is not certain that this would mean a raise; my amendment specifies that an elderly person would get a pension if he applied for it. It might well happen that nobody would ask for it, in which case there would be no supplementary expenditure.

And so, in order for all members to have a chance to express their opinions, I wonder if it would not be better if the Chair would declare these amendments in order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I thank those hon. members who have sought by all available means to enlighten the Chair as to the decision it must make. With hon. members' permission, I think I will start by dealing with some points that were brought up by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters).

[English]

In his concluding remarks, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) said that the Chair could quote no precedent that would satisfy him. I trust the hon. member will accept the fact that the Speaker is not here to satisfy hon. members, but to apply the rules to the best of his ability. The hon. member also spoke of archaic rules, interpretation of the rules and changes in them. He must realize that as long as we proceed under this kind of parliamentary system where precedents and practices are the basis of the system, the Chair cannot accept his argument.

I wonder whether the hon. member for Timiskaming includes Standing Order 62 in the rules which he says are archaic. At the time of the changes to the Standing Orders, Standing Order 62 was not changed. Also, the hon. member suggested that the Chair apply Standing Order 62 for the first motion before us, but with regard to the other motions he suggested that Standing Order 62 is archaic and does not apply. Therefore, the argument he put forward to change this basic opinion cannot be accepted.

[Translation]

Now, to revert to a point I made in my comments this afternoon, I wish to remind hon. members, as I have just done in English, that the Chair is not supposed to give some leeway or be good-natured, but must apply the Standing Orders and see that the practices and customs are upheld.

I agree with hon. members that it would perhaps be advisable to review the Standing Orders, but this is a matter left at the discretion of hon. members who all know that the Committee on Procedure and Organization is already considering the last changes made in 1968.

In my remarks of a while ago, I referred hon. members to Standing Order 62(1) which states and I quote:

Old Age Security Act

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,—

And subsection (2) states that the message of His Excellency shall be printed on the Notice Paper and presented to Mr. Speaker. I do not have such a recommendation at hand for the time being and even if hon. members wish to claim that the reference to the expense of public funds is perhaps not as clear as some people or as the Chair may claim. Even if the Chair is asked to exercise discretion and not to solve financial questions, I completely disagree with the hon. member for Lotbinière because that is precisely one of the main duties of the Chair, namely to consider the measures presented to this House to know whether they comply with our Standing Orders, practices and precedents.

I also referred hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. Citation 246 is quite clear. It reads as follows:

—the royal demand of recommendation . . . must . . . once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced . . .)

—and I do not believe that the recommendation was withdrawn and replaced.

I keep on quoting:

—not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

I fail to see how the Chair can admit that the amendments now before the House are not contrary to citation 246. The hon. member said that that citation was written by the author in the light of past Standing Orders, but I think that Beauchesne's is so much quoted in this House that no decision taken in this House has resulted in shelving this interesting and useful book. The Chair can easily use it. I suggest that no hon. member has yet been able to find fault with these two points.

Let me also strengthen my point by referring hon. members to the debate on procedure which took place on May 16, 1972 when the Speaker had to rule on similar amendments concerning a bill on old age security pensions. One can read on page 2326 of *Hansard* for May 16, 1972, and I quote:

This type of motion requires the recommendation of His Excellency.

And at the bottom of the same page, on the right hand side, one can read:

I suggest that it clearly is not possible for an hon. member to present a bill or an amendment involving disbursements, unless such bill or amendment be accompanied by a recommendation of the Crown.

And on page 2327, on the right hand side, one can read:

I would remind the hon. member for Lotbinière that even if the minister should sponsor the motion before us, it would not be sufficient since it would require the approval of the Crown.

I refer to these statements in an attempt to explain to hon. members that the Chair is not here to change the Standing Orders but to apply them. The hon. member for Lotbinière, in his comments, said that the Chair should go beyond its prerogatives. As stated earlier, he said that it was not the responsibility of the Chair to determine whether a bill or amendment involves public spending and I repeat that on the contrary, it is its duty to do so.