

*Old Age Security Act*

Citation 246(3) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, reads as follows:

(3) The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

In other words, it must be recognized that the royal recommendation establishes the terms and conditions of the financial liabilities which may be proposed to the House, and in this sense the motion of the hon. member for Portneuf is not in order.

[English]

I should like now to deal with the motion which stands in the name of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). Despite the very brilliant argument submitted by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), I find it difficult to ignore the long standing doctrine relating to the financial initiative of the Crown. The hon. member was arguing in the House just the other day that a certain bill would require the royal consent. I think if this House were at any time desirous of changing the doctrine of the financial initiative of the Crown, the royal consent might very well be necessary on that one point. If the hon. member presented the argument that I should have to consider very seriously whether this proposal would not effectively affect one of the prerogatives of the Crown, perhaps I might need to go into the matter more deeply. Yet perhaps that is not necessary.

There are a few more points of view which I was tempted to go into; I suggest to hon. members that that is not necessary. I have expressed the basis on which I have to make the suggestion to hon. members that the motion should not be put.

Before the first motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is put by the Chair, I should like to suggest that motions 1 and 3 might be considered and voted upon as one proposition. Perhaps I might hear from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in this regard.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy with Your Honour's suggestion that motions Nos. 1 and 3 be combined for one debate and one vote, unless, of course, there is unanimous approval of the proposal contained in these two motions. The reason there are two motions is that it seems necessary to make changes in clause 1 of the bill and to delete clause 2 in order to achieve the purpose I have in mind. I am quite happy with Your Honour's suggestion to combine the motions for one debate and one vote.

Earlier today I had a conversation with the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). He was hopeful but apprehensive as to whether his motion would be in order. He suggested that if his motion was not in order he would be happy to second my motion. I welcome his support, unless the President of the Privy Council (Mr.

[Mr. Speaker.]

MacEachen) or another government member would prefer to second it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will put the motion.

[Translation]

I see that the hon. member for Lotbinière wants to have the floor. He wishes perhaps to raise a point of order. With his permission I will now read the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and then ask the hon. member for Lotbinière whether he still wants to raise a point of order.

[English]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:**

That Bill C-202, to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by deleting from Clause 1 lines 4 to 11 at page 1.

**Mr. Speaker:** By order of the House, motion No. 3 is being combined with motion No. 1 on the understanding that the debate can range on both motions and they will be subject to one vote. I will put motion No. 3.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:**

That Bill C-202 to amend the Old Age Security Act be amended by deleting Clause 2 therefrom.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before calling on the hon. member from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I will call on the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

[Translation]

Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to raise a point of order?

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

I did not dare interrupt you when you made your ruling, on motion No. 2, but when I made my comments to prove the validity of this amendment, I did not have the Standing Orders at hand. Now that I have them, I would like to quote Standing Order 63.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I will allow the hon. member a few moments to make his point, but he will recognize that it is altogether out of order to have a debate on a point of order after a ruling has been made by the Chair. In any event, the hon. member will perhaps be able, with leave of the House, to briefly put forward the arguments he wanted to submit to the Chair a moment ago.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Agreed.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, what has prompted the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) to move this amendment is Standing Order 63 of the House of Commons which reads as follows:

All aids and supplies granted to Her Majesty by the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty as parliamentarians, not only to take part in this debate, but to make proposals and suggest limitations as I was saying at the beginning, according to this Standing Order, because we