

chapter XXI of May's 18th edition, one can read, and I quote:

[English]

Amendments are inadmissible if they refer to, or are not intelligible without, subsequent amendments or schedules, of which notice has not been given . . .

[Translation]

I gloss over the remainder, Mr. Speaker, and one will note that again the Standing Orders are respected. According to subsection (5), this would mean the negation of the bill. Far from rejecting the bill, from opposing it, from submitting amendments which would reject it, we want to complete the bill. We want to improve it and that is in conformity with the citations I quoted earlier.

Mr. Speaker, subsection (5) gives two extremely interesting examples which prove the admissibility of our amendments and I will refer you to subsection (6) that I will abstain from reading to save time because we do not want to kill the bill; indeed we want that bill to pass as fast as possible and to really meet the needs of our fellow Canadians. Consequently, I only refer the Chair to subsections 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Subsection 9 provides as follows:

[English]

An amendment is out of order if it is offered at a wrong place in the bill . . .

[Translation]

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is the proper clause, that the right clause is being amended and it goes on up to subsection 12.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any further time of the House. I still have many other quotations to make, namely the record of the House of Commons proceedings for December 11, 1969 when a debate on procedure has held. Reference is made—the Chair has also spoken about it—to citation 263(2) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition of Parliamentary Rules and Procedures which is found on page 220. I will quote it.

Mr. Speaker, while I do so, I would respectfully ask you to try and see the relation between the citation and the notices of motions which we are introducing. The citation reads as follows:

(2) The principle that the sanction of the Crown must be given to every grant of money drawn from the public revenue, applies equally to the taxation levied to provide that revenue. No motion can therefore be made to impose a tax, save by a Minister of the Crown, unless such tax be in substitution, by way of equivalent, for taxation at that moment submitted to the consideration of Parliament; nor can the amount of a tax proposed on behalf of the Crown be augmented, nor any alteration made in the area of imposition.

Mr. Speaker, I will refer you to the five notices of motions since they have to be dealt with together and I point out that none of those provides for a tax increase or a change in the group of people which would be taxed. Those notices of motions have absolutely nothing to do with taxation. They have to do with the terms of eligibility for old age security pensions. This is something entirely different, Mr. Speaker.

We are not asking the government to vote credits or Parliament to pass an act imposing a tax to finance old

Old Age Security Act

age security pensions. We know that this government has no other solution in its crazy system to finance old age pensions than to impose further taxes.

The amendments moved by the hon. member for Abitibi as well as myself and the hon. members for Bellechasse and Champlain and Portneuf deal only with the terms of eligibility for the old age pension.

This is why Citation 263(2) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, do not apply. Citation 276(1) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, do not apply and neither do Citations 268(2) and 276(8).

Citation 276(1) reads as follows:

—the royal initiation in taxation implies the exclusive right to define the *incidence* as well as the *amount* of burdens to be placed upon the people, and that an amendment which transfers a burden to taxpayers nor previously liable is an infringement on this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, we do not advocate heavier taxes for the people. We are fighting for fewer taxes. We do not urge either that one class, one category of citizens be taxed to pay for old age security pensions. We simply request that the House of Commons revise its position, revise the conditions of eligibility provided for in Bill C-147, which is before us, in order that these conditions of eligibility be broader and tailored to the needs of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this is our mandate and I figure that it is of utmost importance for each member of this House, whatever parts he belongs to, to be able to present measures for the improvement of bills, if not, we are wasting our time.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It being five o'clock, we have to suspend the debate on this point of procedure, and even adjourn the decision until the House resumes at 8 p.m. and at this moment—

[English]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed—

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of the attendance of the four House leaders to ask, in view of the great significance of this legislation, whether we ought not to proceed from five to six o'clock with consideration of Bill C-147, since we definitely want this bill to pass but with the amendments which we have introduced.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

[English]

Is there consent to suspend private members' hour?

Mr. Baldwin: No, Mr. Speaker. There is an important bill which has to be discussed at five o'clock. It may be that after a short speech the government may see fit to give its approval to the principle of the bill. We would be glad at that time to resume the matter we are now discussing.