presented, and to examine the different Standing Orders and the citations from Beauchesne, and I think I am in a position to render a decision at this time on all of the motions. I will not accept the suggestion of the hon. member to limit my decision to one of these motions.

**Mr. Peters:** I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you can only call one of these motions at a time. I have asked that they be called one at a time. You would need unanimous consent to call all five of them en bloc, and I suggest that you do not have that unanimous consent.

# [Translation]

**Mr. Fortin:** Concerning the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I made some comments and quotations just now about notice of motion No. 1, but if I had known that you were intending to consider a ruling on all five of our party's amendments, I would have brought forward arguments on the other resolutions, since some of them had a bearing on the eligibility age of 60, some are financial motions and others again are strictly administrative ones.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member naturally has a right to comment on each of these motions. The Chair considers that the notices of motions are definitely interrelated, and I think therefore that I can say straight away, on my own initiative, that the reasons behind the ruling that I propose to make concerning the five motions are based on Standing orders, and have precedents in previous rulings and opinions, or in interpretations of Standing orders in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. I do not see why the Chair should have to make a ruling on any one motion in isolation.

### [English]

The hon. member for Timiskaming seems to be asking the Chair to render a decision on all of these motions one at a time, because only one motion can be put at a time. The Chair hesitates to accept the suggestion of the hon. member because if these motions are out of order they cannot be put. I do not think the Chair is automatically forced to put a motion and then to make a decision on its acceptability. The Chair has had enough time to make up its mind as to the acceptability of these motions.

### [Translation]

—the same applies. I would therefore ask the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) as well as all other hon. members who wish to comment on the relevancy or irrelevancy of the amendments now before the House to do so immediately.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I remember that, in the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, with the co-operation of the members of that committee and its chairman, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), each one of these motions was discussed separately. This is why I find it is more or less fair for the Chair to state emphatically that the five motions are out of order, since they were considered in committee.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I am going to abide by your ruling and I shall regretfully argue about these five notices of motions.

# Old Age Security Act

[English]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might make a suggestion. I appreciate the problem that faces Your Honour, but I think I can also see the point of view of the hon. members who proposed these motions. It does seem to me it would be quite in order for Your Honour to wait until there has been discussion on the procedural acceptability of all five motions and then make one ruling, or of course you could rule on the first one, and indicate that you are likely to rule the same way on the others. But it does seem to me that the members who put down these motions have the right to express their views on the procedural acceptability of them in the way that they choose, whether on all at once, or on each one at a time. I suggest that you hear argument on each of them seriatim and then Your Honour could make a ruling at the end of that, with possibly one ruling on all five.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The Chair will try to be as fair as it can. For the purpose of facilitating the discussion, perhaps at this time I could put forward some points. The problem is whether the Standing Order or the citation on which I am ready to base my decision will supply enough ground to make my decision on all of these motions.

### • (1640)

The hon. parliamentary secretary has referred to Standing Order 62 and he also referred to citation 246 of Beauchesne. I think we have in these two points the crux of the problem with which we are faced as to the acceptability of these motions that are presently suggested to the House.

[Translation]

I should like to point out to hon. members that the five motions now before the House reveal the implicit and obvious intention to increase public expenses beyond the limits set by the the recommendation accompanying the bill, which reads as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure to amend the Old Age Security Act; to increase the basic amount of the monthly old age pension to one hundred dollars effective April 1, 1973 with future escalation to commence April 1, 1974; and under Part II of the Act to clarify which year is the base year in the escalation formula and to simplify the calculation of income.

That obviously concerns especially the first motion now before the House. Nevertheless, the other motions are also contrary to His Excellency's recommendation, as they tend to increase the expense of public funds in addition to going beyond the scope of the bill, but I will get back to that.

Earlier, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) referred to Standing Order 75 and quoted paragraphs (5) and (8) of the Standing Orders of the House and even paragraph (10). In other words, he referred to a Standing Order outlining the procedure for introducing a motion similar to the one he himself introduced, motion No. 1, and the others as to the time allowed. Then he says that in Standing Order 75 (8), it is clearly stated that whenever a motion is introduced under Standing Order 75, it shall be open to debate and amendments.

Finally, referring to Standing Order 75(10), he bases his theory on the Chair's authority to select, combine or