

after lunch and it may well be that I may have some rather unique and unusual arguments in addition to the first rate arguments advanced by my friend from Lotbinière. These arguments may persuade Your Honour to depart from the ruling which I feel you were going to deliver and which might not be in accordance with what would be acceptable, or at least, would not make us happy.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I think that there is a situation here which might well be considered by the Chair. Although I understand that it is not the duty of the Chair to be daringly innovative with regard to the rules, and I do not say that disparagingly, nevertheless there is a point of view that I want to put before Your Honour. It may be that you will think, on the basis of precedents and citations, it is not a valid proposition and that you cannot accept it. On the other hand, if I argue the matter, my argument may commend itself to the House for some future action.

Without question, it is increasingly difficult for hon. members these days, outside of matters that are referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to adopt that changing and contemporary approach which to some extent is required with regard to matters such as I am about to raise. From time to time precedents are set which are not subject to an appeal in any way to the House. Consequently, when a new approach is introduced, an approach such as I suggest this is, it is no easy matter for Your Honour, no matter how well disposed you may be, to accept the new proposition. To put it shortly, the amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) suggests a variation in the payment of the old age security allowance. I put it to Your Honour that we must look at the source from which this fund comes. Although I do not have the chapter before me, I believe a chapter in the Statutes of Canada, 1952, established the old age security fund. As a result of the terms of the pertinent legislation, as amended in 1967, that fund was established as a trust fund within the four corners of the consolidated revenue fund. That trust fund is charged with the payment of moneys to meet the old age security payments which are being varied by the legislation now before the House. To meet these, there has been 2 per cent added to the sales tax, 3 per cent to corporate income tax and a 4 per cent levy with regard to personal income tax which go into the trust fund.

My proposition is this, Mr. Speaker. When a fund of this kind is established, it is competent for a member of this House to propose variations of the scheme of payments made in legislation such as the House is now considering, provided that that proposal will not so draw upon that old age security fund as to make it essential for further taxes or levies to be imposed on the people of Canada.

It is difficult for us to know what was in the minds of those who enacted section 54 of the British North America Act. I am sure that they did not contemplate the kind of arrangements which have been worked out with

Old Age Security Act

regard to this particular fund, the unemployment insurance fund, the Canada Pension Fund, and so on. For that reason, I submit that judicial notice should be taken of the fact that there is now a surplus of \$1 billion in the old age security fund. The very modest and reasonable increase proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe North is not in any way so alarming as to deplete this fund. The proposal would not in any way involve a tax or impost. It would neither change the government's revenues nor cause the Crown and the ministers involved to impose further taxation. I, therefore, submit that a trust fund of this nature, which is charged with these particular payments, may be varied in the sense that the hon. member for Simcoe North is attempting to vary it.

Before sitting down, may I add that Your Honour, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and I had an interesting exchange on November 20, last year, when we were dealing with the water bill. At that time I took the position which I fear Your Honour is likely to take now. I argued that the imposition of such tolls and fines as were contemplated for certain purposes in that bill constituted such an imposition of taxation as required a variation in the royal recommendation. Your Honour held that so far as that aspect was concerned, it was not a tax which required a variation in the royal recommendation. I put that point to Your Honour in the hope that the most competent authority in the House today, Mr. Speaker, will support my proposition.

Mr. Speaker: May I first refer to motion No. 2, which stands in the name of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin).

[*Translation*]

Motion numbered 2 in the name of the hon. member for Portneuf, it seems to me, is clearly beyond the provisions of the royal recommendation. It is in this regard and strictly from the standpoint of procedure that I take the liberty of informing the hon. member for Portneuf and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that the motion is out of order.

The arguments which the hon. member for Lotbinière has presented for the consideration of the hon. members and of the Chair are interesting and relevant, but they are of the kind that could be submitted during the debate in support of the motion made by the hon. member. I hope that in the course of the debate this afternoon or tonight—or perhaps tomorrow or even next week, which none of us would wish—the hon. member for Portneuf, the hon. member for Lotbinière as well as other hon. members will nevertheless have the opportunity to bring in the arguments of which the hon. member for Lotbinière has just advised us.

Just the same, as far as I am concerned, I must keep not to the gist of the hon. member's proposal but to his view on procedure. And in my opinion, the hon. member's proposal would establish a universal monthly payment to every person who has attained the age of sixty years. If my memory serves me right, such universal payment would amount to \$150.