

Old Age Security Act Amendment

alternative scheme to that proposed with the royal recommendation", we are not here proposing an alternative scheme that substantially alters the royal recommendation. It cannot necessarily be concluded, Mr. Chairman, that our proposition will increase the amount of money which according to the minister will be made available under this particular scheme.

The resolution of the government does not disclose the exact amount of money that is to be expended. There may be quite a bit of doubt as to what that total will be. In fact, the minister indicated that there is a wide spread of several million dollars in his figures. Our alternative scheme might not exceed the actual amount of money that would be spent under the government's scheme. So we are putting before the house, and I think quite properly, an alternative to the proposition put forward by the minister in order to give the house a chance to decide which of the two is preferable under the circumstances.

The Chairman: If there is no further discussion of this matter perhaps the committee would wish me to make a ruling now. This ruling is on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon. The amendment reads as follows:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"The government give consideration to introducing a measure to amend the Old Age Security Act, effective with respect to months beginning with January, 1967, to provide for the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and for charging to the Old Age Security Fund under that Act of an additional monthly amount of \$25 to all pensioners thereunder.

During the time that has elapsed since the amendment was moved the Chair has had an opportunity to give serious and careful consideration to the validity or regularity of the proposed amendment. I suggest to the committee that the Chair entertains serious doubts that this proposal is indeed an amendment. It would appear that the amendment in the first instance is in the nature of an alternative scheme, and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre during the course of his remarks stated that it is an alternative scheme. But as such it would be an expanded negative.

If the amendment were ruled to be in order and adopted by this committee the main question, which is the consideration of the resolution proposed by the minister, would be terminated. This committee of the whole, as are all committees of this house, is limited in its

[Mr. Churchill.]

deliberation to the terms of its order of reference—in this case the terms of the resolution proposed by the Minister of National Health and Welfare which was referred to the committee of the whole house.

Under the heading "Procedure in committee of the whole house on expenditure" in May's seventeenth edition, page 798, the following is stated under the subheading "Procedure on amendments":

● (7:40 p.m.)

The approval or the reduction of the expenditure under consideration, or an increase in the stringency of the terms and conditions of the charge thereby created, are the matters specially entrusted to such a committee, and to these objects amendments are directed.

An amendment proposing to substitute for the resolution an argumentative justification for the refusal of the demand is out of order, as are also amendments proposed with a view to substituting an alternative scheme to that proposed with the royal recommendation.

If the committee would permit the Chair to make a further reference to May's seventeenth edition at page 632, I should like to read a paragraph appearing under the heading "Reasoned amendments", which says:

Since the primary purpose of the committee is to consider and amend in detail matters which have been referred to it, and since such matters have, in the case of bills, previously been agreed to in principle by the house or, in the case of the three kinds of committees dealing with public charges . . . are matters in which the initiative properly belongs to the government, it is not usually in order in committee of the whole house to move an amendment to leave out all the words after the first word in a resolution in order to add other words. There are precedents, however, for amendments of this type being moved in committee of the whole House upon resolutions (not imposing charges) which were preliminary to the introduction of bills.

Respecting my earlier remarks having to do with the proposed amendment being in order as an alternative proposal or alternative scheme, I refer the committee to section 4 of citation 250 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

The fundamental terms of a money resolution submitted to the house with the Governor-General's recommendation upon which a committee of the whole is set up cannot be amended. Amendments will only be in order if they fall within the terms of the resolution. The procedure in committee on those resolutions follows in principle the procedure of the committee of supply, and amendments are out of order if they are proposed with a view to substituting an alternative scheme to that proposed with the royal recommendation.

For all these reasons, with all deference to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition I have to rule the amendment out of order.