

1972, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration and report."

The Chair is required to determine whether there is a *prima facie* case of privilege. If a ruling were made in the affirmative, the honourable Member's motion could be put and debated and the House itself would determine whether the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for consideration and report.

The suggestion made by the honourable Member for York South is therefore that the words spoken in the House by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert found a *prima facie* case of privilege. When the matter was first raised in the House this afternoon and indeed when the motion was proposed to the House by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) yesterday, the Chair expressed its reluctance at finding that the statements or conduct of honourable Members should be referred to a committee for scrutiny. This is a feeling which I am sure is shared by all honourable Members. It is certainly a view which is based on a long standing tradition in this House. I am advised that the last instance when a specific charge made by one Member against another was accepted by the Chair for consideration as a question of privilege, goes back to the year 1924. On that occasion and on the four other occasions prior to 1924 when such a question went before a committee of the House, the charge against the Member had reference to alleged wrongdoings.

The procedural position was explained clearly by Mr. Speaker Michener in a ruling dated June 1959 and reported at page 582 of the *Journals* of the House of Commons for that year. The then Speaker ruled that a charge in specific terms had to be made before a *prima facie* case of privilege could be found. The motion proposed by the honourable Member for York South (Mr. Lewis) does not meet this test. His motion takes issue with what the honourable Member calls the false charges made by the Right Honourable Member for Prince Albert. The assertion made by the honourable Member for York South cannot be construed in my estimation as being a specific charge as set forth from the Chair on many previous occasions and in particular by Mr. Speaker Michener in the ruling to which I have just referred. We are dealing here essentially with a matter of debate.

I take the liberty to repeat the suggestion made yesterday that this is essentially a matter of debate. I feel that honourable Members were suggesting a more acceptable procedure when they themselves suggested yesterday that the matter might be the subject of a debate under another Standing Order or procedure. If there continues to be a disposition by honourable Members to debate this question, I assume that by agreement, simple arrangements can be made to achieve this purpose.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Laing (Vancouver South), seconded by Mr. Munro,—That Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and

Allowance Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act, to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, be now read a second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By unanimous consent, the House proceeded to the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and of the following motions:

Motion numbered (1) standing in the name of Mr. Rodrigue,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by inserting a comma after the word "who" in Clause 2 at line 23, page 1 and adding the following:

"has reached age 60."

Motion numbered (2) standing in the name of Mr. Laprise,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting the word "who" in Clause 2 at line 23, page 1 and substituting therefor the following:

"even if his age is lower than the provisions of the present Act if the spouse receives a monthly pension by virtue of the said Act."

Motion numbered (3) standing in the name of Mr. Fortin,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting from Clause 2 lines 20 to 23, page 1 inclusive and substituting therefor the following:

"3(1) Under the provisions of the present Act and regulations, a monthly pension may be paid to every person, even though the age is lower than that provided for in the present Act once the person reaches age 60, if the spouse receives a monthly pension."

Motion numbered (4) standing in the name of Mr. Gauthier,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended (a) by deleting from Clause 3 the words "eighty dollars" at line 3, page 2 and substituting therefor the words "two hundred dollars" (b) by making consequential amendments to Clause 5.

Mr. Speaker ruled the said proposed motions out of order in that they involved an additional expenditure of money and thereby infringed upon the initiative of the Crown.