

Privy Council for Canada and the making of the order has been approved by a resolution of the House of Commons.

(3) Expenditures required under an order made under subsection (1) shall be paid for out of monies to be appropriated by Parliament."

#### RULING BY MR. ACTING SPEAKER

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Laniel): I thank honourable Members for their contribution in helping the Chair make a decision. I agree that the amendment before us is well drafted in that it could be looked at as a proper case.

I listened to the argument of the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that statistics from Statistics Canada might not correspond to the Consumer Price Index for all kinds of reasons. This was getting into the debate itself which the Chair cannot do and cannot use as an argument.

In my opinion, the decision that has to be rendered at this time is based on two points. The first point is to try and determine whether the amendment departs from the principle adopted on second reading. The honourable Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) referred to an amendment that was accepted by the Chair last night. That amendment proposed to refer a bill back to committee to amend one particular clause. Over the years it has been the practice to accept at third reading stage a six month hoist amendment or refer a bill back to a committee for the purpose of reconsidering one particular clause. In this case, the Chair is wondering whether the amendment would not tend to change the principle which has been approved on second reading. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to citation 415 of Beauchesne at page 287. He even read paragraph four of that citation which, to my mind, is very clear. I might perhaps repeat it: "On the third reading of a bill an amendment to refer back to the Committee of the Whole must not tend to change the principle approved on second reading."

Basing myself on this paragraph, I find myself wondering whether the committee itself would have the power to deal with such an amendment. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment which has been proposed is really one which brings in a new subject, a new approach, if one considers the debate which has taken place and the study which has been carried out at the earlier stages.

Again, if we read citation 418, we find a similar thought expressed in the following terms: "The question for the third reading is put immediately after the report from the Committee of the Whole. All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the bill."

The Chair is wondering whether the proposal made in this amendment does not involve a new matter, a new approach to the bill itself.

Honourable Members might also refer to Beauchesne at the bottom of page 527 where the rules which govern reasoned amendments are set out. We find that the first principle to be taken into consideration when drafting or accepting an amendment is the rule of relevancy.

There is another aspect with which the Chair has to be concerned. It is the financial aspect. I wonder whether the amendment in the form in which it is presented is not seeking to do indirectly what the honourable Member cannot do directly. Citation 246(3) of Beauchesne's, Fourth Edition, makes it clear that honourable Members should not try to do things indirectly which they cannot do directly. I think I should read this paragraph: "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 or recommendation is attached must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objects and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge."

Although the other citations from Beauchesne, 415 and 418, made me hesitate about accepting the amendment before us, having regard to the rule of relevancy, my decision is confirmed by what is contained in Citation 246. Looking again at the amendment I can only conclude that it puts forward a new financial proposition, one which I cannot accept at this time.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Fortin, seconded by Mr. Dionne, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, to consider the possibility of:

(a) lowering the age of entitlement to an Old Age Security pension to 60;

(b) granting an Old Age Security pension to all persons even if his age is lower than the provisions of the present Act, provided that the spouse receives a monthly pension by virtue of the said Act;

(c) eliminating the principle of a supplement and establishing the basic amount at \$200.00 per month.