

amendment cannot be put. The hon. member of course knows as well as I do that the arguments he has just presented can be brought forward at the third reading stage. Hon. members for Lotbinière and Bellechasse, and their colleagues as well, will of course have the opportunity at that time to come back to the substantial arguments they have just submitted for the consideration of the Chair.

• (2120)

It is in blushing a little perhaps that I must say that my ruling concerning motions Nos. 1 and 2 applies, unfortunately, to motion No. 3 as well as to motion No. 4 which reads as follows:

That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended (a) by deleting from Clause 3 the words "eighty dollars" at line 3, page 2 and substituting therefor the words "two hundred dollars" (b) by making consequential amendments to Clause 5.

I notice that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and perhaps members are ready to support the motion moved by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), who is trying to convince the Chair that this amendment is in order, and I will hear his argument.

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I should like very much tonight to persuade the Chair to accept my amendment, because I think that the legislation as amended would better reflect pension reality.

When reference is made to pensions in this House, people think that this is not welfare. This is why I ask that it be a pension of \$200 a month and not a pension of \$100 and a welfare allowance of \$100. These terms are always used. The public is going to be told that senior citizens have been granted a pension.

Actually, it is not a pension. This is why I suggest through my amendment that the pension be increased to \$200 instead of \$80 and that the words welfare assistance be deleted.

If you compute the amount of taxes used to pay this pension, and if you take into account the total number of older people, it can be estimated that these pensions and allowances will cost \$150 a month for each senior citizen.

What else shall we do? We are supposed to give people \$150; actually, we are cheating them because we are not really giving them \$150. However, it costs more than \$150 to send all these investigators to meddle with our senior citizens' affairs and create all sorts of trouble for them.

Our senior citizens deserve a pension and we must provide them with one and put an end to this situation where they must have recourse to social welfare.

Maybe some hon. members will again talk about the lack of money, as it was stated a moment ago. This goes beyond the scope of the act, for it will be necessary to spend more public funds. If the government will not make any change to its budget, let it provide for a new issue, through the Bank of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wish to indicate to the hon. member for Roberval that my objection to the motion was not related in any way to the Bank of Canada but rather

Old Age Security Act

to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms and to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

The hon. member understands that as well as I do and probably better than I do. I wish to remind him that the very interesting arguments he has just put forward could be very easily presented, I am sure, when the motion for third reading will be considered.

For the time being, I am deeply sorry to conclude that to conform to an old tradition, such a motion cannot, at the present time, be presented to the House.

Does the hon. member for Lotbinière wish to rise a point of order?

Mr. Fortin: No, Mr. Speaker, I thought we had skipped motion No. 3, unless I am absent-minded.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that the comments I have made in respect of motions Nos. 1 and 2 equally apply to motion No. 3. I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member for Lotbinière if he has any comments or special considerations to submit to the House. I have not the slightest doubt that my hon. friends would be happy to listen to his comments regarding motion No. 3. I for one, would gladly do so.

Mr. Fortin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kind attention. I agree once more that it is a question of spending public funds, but here again, it is the principle that should prevail namely that on the one hand, you are right in applying the rules, but on the other hand, as you say so eloquently, all my colleagues are interested in helping our senior citizens. I wonder if the minister who is empowered to spend public funds could not sponsor the motions in question, provided there is unanimous consent, in order to solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the hon. member for Lotbinière that even if the minister should sponsor the motion before us, it would not be sufficient since it would require the approval of the Crown. This approval should appear in the order paper and, as I said, I have been through this document but could not anywhere find that His Excellency has made a recommendation regarding the expenses involved in motion No. 3.

There are still a few moments left before we come to the consideration of the other motions. The hon. member might get in touch with His Excellency to determine whether it is possible to obtain his consent in this regard.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I will certainly be in touch with His Excellency after the next election.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

An hon. Member: Is this just to pass the time?

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): No it's precisely because we do not want to waste any time.

I have noticed the interest of the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) in our debates