

*Canada Assistance Plan*

grounds upon which an amendment could be ruled out of order. If the minister had other reasons to give, I wish he had given them, instead of saying that we had dealt with this matter on the first vote of confidence at the beginning of this session. I refer him to the words used by the hon. member for Essex West (Mr. Gray) in his speech at the resolution stage of this measure. At that time the hon. member set forth clearly the results consequent on a defeat of the government. He set them forth more clearly than I would have been able to do. The position of Social Credit then was very clear. We said we would vote against the motion of non-confidence; that we did not have a piece of legislation before us, and what this country needed was a parliament in session to begin working on legislation. I regret that the minister chooses now to assume that we had, in effect, joined the government in removing any possibility of an increase in the old age pension during the life of this session. To argue against the amendment on that ground is perhaps not the unkindest cut of all, but rather a sharp one.

The Canada Assistance Plan will have the result of increasing the security pension for some pensioners across this country. I should like to discuss this aspect more fully on second reading, but our regret is that it does not go farther.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I want to restrict my remarks exclusively to one aspect of this point of order, namely that because the subject matter of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is in the form it is it constitutes a request by this house to deal with a matter which has already been disposed of by the house on January 20. I should like, first of all, to invite Your Honour to make a distinction with regard to the suggestion made by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner). As I read the words of the amendment upon which Mr. Speaker Michener ruled, and the wording of the present amendment, I would point out that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre calls for the immediate introduction of concurrent legislation. It is quite obvious, then, that he is not asking the house to do away with the bill which is now before the house; he is simply suggesting that we take a certain course of action with respect to another matter which shall be concurrent to proceeding with this measure as well.

[Mr. Johnston.]

I think there is a clear indication there that this bill will not disappear. The intention of the hon. member is not that this bill shall disappear, but that its future terms shall be regarded as being correlated to and concurrent with another measure. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you can distinguish this particular matter from the precedent cited by the Minister without Portfolio.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I want to go a step further. The wording of the present amendment which is before the house includes the phrase "the government should give consideration". This is a device well utilized and hallowed by generations of practice in this house. It is not a demand that the government shall express its opinion as being in favour of a specific proposal, in this case an increase in old age pensions. The wording of the want of confidence motion on January 20, as reported at page 58 of *Hansard*, is as follows:

We respectfully regret that Your Excellency's advisers have omitted to provide for an immediate increase from \$75 per month to \$100 per month—

That, Mr. Speaker, is a concrete and specific expression of regret that the government has not done something.

What the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is suggesting is that the government should give consideration to a certain matter. I think this is a type of wording which Your Honour must take into account in arriving at a decision. The amendment says that the government should give consideration to the immediate introduction of concurrent legislation. I think this is important.

Having in mind the practice in this house, if the point of order raised by the minister is to be given effect to, then it will mean, if we cannot make such a distinction as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre sought to make, that during the course of this session, which may last a very long time, this house will be precluded under any circumstances from dealing at any time or in any way with an increase of pensions under the Old Age Security Act from \$75 to \$100 a month.

We can take it, then, that the government has sought to use this procedural device of putting the matter out of the path of parliament at any time during the course of this session. I think that from that point of view the ruling of Your Honour on this aspect of the matter is of some considerable importance.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, you have already received a good deal of advice on this matter,