

Old Age Security Act

amend certain motions presented to the House, but he forgot that Standing Order 75(6) states the following:

(6) When a recommendation of the Governor General is required in relation to any amendment to be proposed at the report stage of a bill, at least twenty-four hours written notice shall be given—

I do not suggest that Standing Order 75(6) provides a full answer to the hon. member's question, but as this provision contained in the Standing Order refers to the requirement, in some cases, of obtaining a recommendation of the Governor General, this means automatically, at least in my opinion, that the above-mentioned Standing Order does not prevail over Standing Order 62 which deals precisely with financial provisions and which reads as follows:

62. (1) This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

(2) The message and recommendation of the Governor General in relation to any bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost shall be printed on the Notice Paper and in the *Votes and Proceedings* when any such measure is to be introduced and the text of such recommendation shall be printed with or annexed to every such bill.

Now let me refer to Citation 246(3) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, page 207, which 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to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.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 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.

Hon. members will therefore be able to see that Standing Order 62 and the Citation of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms provide the Chair with enough arguments to enable the Chair to consider at least the 5 motions now before us, and with enough precedents to support a negative decision with regard to the proposals before us.

Of course, if hon. members wish to further enlighten the Chair, I am willing to listen to all arguments but I hope that the points they will make will relate to those matters I have raised.

[English]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, might I simply say that we are not taking any part in this debate. After many years of the practice of law I have learned the sound and salutary rule, never get into family fights between husband and wife.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to ask you to refer to May, 18th Edition of 1971, page 507, which states, and I quote:

[English]

Amendments may be made in every part of the bill whether in clauses or the schedules. Clauses may be left out and new clauses and schedules added. Amendments to the preamble and title also admissible where amendments have been made to the bill which render them necessary.

[Translation]

Then, Mr. Speaker, we are referred to page 509 and I shall spare the House my English. It is a citation from *Parliamentary Practice* of Sir T. Erskine May explaining

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

the procedure regarding inadmissible amendments at the report stage.

I would also refer you to the chapter dealing with inadmissible amendments on page 508 of the same edition, namely to chapter 21 where 11 cases of inadmissible amendments are listed.

It goes without saying that amendments which do not pertain to the bill are out of order. I would point out that this does not apply to the five amendments we are bringing forward. Ours deal directly with Bill C-147 and are not intended to prevent its passage but to improve it and ensure that it meets the needs of our fellow citizens more adequately.

Paragraph (2) on page 508 which deals with inadmissible amendments reads as follows:

• (1650)

[English]

An amendment cannot be admitted, if it is governed by or dependent upon amendments which have already been negated . . .

[Translation]

That does not apply to our five amendments, Mr. Speaker.

In paragraph (3), it is said that amendment inconsistent with or opposed to the bill or to the committee is decision, are out of order. That does not apply either because, through the contributions of the hon. members for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), Champlain (Mr. Matte) and Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), I succeeded in convincing the committee to pass a resolution to study the possibility of increasing the pension's basic amount, lowering the age of eligibility and paying the pension to the spouse of a pensioner regardless of age.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules, the terms of reference of the committee were to study Bill C-147, that is all. The Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs agreed, thanks to the arguments of my colleagues, to adopt unanimously a resolution to study the matter and to allow the committee to expand his terms of reference on his own account.

Mr. Speaker, that indicates that we would like the House of Commons to take the same position so that we could go further than what is provided in the bill and that the House be authorized to study the substance of those amendments. Notice of motion No 1 moved by the hon. member for Abitibi tends to increase the basic amount; motion No 2, moved by this member tends to lower to 60 the age of eligibility; motion No 3 of the hon. member for Bellechasse tends to give the old age pension to the spouse when one of the two has received it; motion No 4 of the hon. member for Champlain provides an alternative while respecting individual freedom, namely that between 60 and 65, anyone who applies will be eligible to that pension; and motion No 5 moved by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) provides for the payment of the old age security pension to every handicapped person who is 50 years of age.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, all this corresponds to what I have said until now. If one refers to paragraph (4) of