Old Age Security Act

domestic animals was put on the order paper by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan). Item No. 24 dealing with extending the limits of the capital of Canada was put on the order paper by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle). Item No. 32, dealing with proxy voting, was put on the order paper by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner).

All these items were put on the order paper on October 15 and I think it is time we received the reasons why they have been passed over in the intervals. It is six months or more since they were put on the order paper, and I should like to see them proceeded with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has the right to raise this point of order again. I should like to refer him to Standing Order 18(1) which reads:

All items standing on the Orders of the Day, except Government Orders, shall be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the Order Paper.

By the rule book this means that the House should call item by item those that appear on the order paper. The only problem is that if they are not proceeded with they go down to the end of the list, and the hon. member directly concerned loses his turn. The practice in recent years has been to ascertain ahead of time the availability of members to proceed with their bills.

If the hon. member does not give unanimous consent I will call each of the bills on the order paper, one by one. Of course he did not say that he would not give unanimous consent if he received the explanations requested. I am not in the position to give that explanation, however, but if any hon. member in the House can give the answer to this request we are ready to listen; otherwise we will proceed in the normal way as the Standing Order directs.

Miss Campbell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us on private members' hour—

An hon. Member: No bill has been called yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Because of the dissent of the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert) I have to say that the bill in front of the House at this time is Bill C-208, an act respecting National Heritage Day, standing in the name of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), to be proceeded with at third reading stage, unless there is consent to go directly to Bill C-235.

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be difficult. I just want to point out that this is the fourth occasion I have raised this matter. I think we should be given reasons why these bills are left on the order paper for six months. I am not going to carry on further with this procedure today. The normal process should apply, but from here on members should be ready to proceed when their bills are called.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to proceed today with the consideration of Bill C-235 Standing in the name of the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Whittaker)?

[Mr. Herbert.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And that all other bills preceding this bill retain their place on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss Campbell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I regret my inexperience in presenting this point of order but Bill C-235 now before the House, under the provisions of Section 54 of the BNA Act needs a resolution. If this bill should pass the House today it would mean that a private member has been able to ask for an appropriation of funds. Under the BNA Act this is virtually impossible. I submit this bill is out of order because it has no royal resolution accompanying it. According to Beauchesne money bills should have royal recommendation and be introduced by a minister of the government.

Mr. Macquarrie: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe that if this bill is standing on the order paper after the scrutiny of Mr. Speaker and others, its credibility is somewhat in order. Having studied the bill very carefully I see that what it intends and proposes is the extension of a development for recognition of certain citizen groups, and it does not in any way impose upon the national treasury. *En passant*, in reference to the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), I think he is unaware of the great progress made on a bill in respect of National Heritage Day through committee. That is why there has been great agreement on this matter.

• (1610)

Mr. Whittaker: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think it is terrible to use the rules of this House in this manner against old age pensioners and I do not subscribe to the statement that the bill is out of order, or that it would add excess expenditure. The bill is attempting to provide a qualifying period for overseas service and to treat that time as time spent in Canada for purposes of qualifying for the old age pension.

Surely the government is not going to argue that there is no money for old age pensions. In this bill we are only talking about the qualification for an old age pension. In many instances people have served in this country in the armed forces and not gone overseas, and they have qualified. We are talking about people like that, and about people who were stationed outside Canada. I hope members of the government have not come here to say that there is no money for old age pensions. This bill, if passed, does not necessarily mean anybody is going to qualify. It merely sets out certain conditions they must meet if and when they do qualify. Once again this shows how selfish and self-centred is the government with which we are dealing here.

Miss Campbell: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the intent of the bill before the House is to include a new category of persons eligible for old age security, it would be adding to the Old Age Security Act as it presently stands. I don't think anyone can say that the government is not concerned about the old age security of people in Canada. The record speaks for itself. If Bill C-235 were to make even one new person entitled to money under the