

*Old Age Security Act*

Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and social affairs be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion for concurrence agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** When shall the said bill be read a third time? By leave, now?

**Some hon. Members:** By leave now.

**Mr. Munro** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that the House gets an opportunity to preview an amendment, but on this occasion hon. members have had a good opportunity to look at one. The amendment that I intend to move has been dealt with by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). It is that the bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, with an instruction to consider the advisability of inserting therein the following clause:

The Governor in Council may, by order, increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since the 1st January 1967—

What we are seeking is simple justice. I find myself facing quite a paradox. Not being a lawyer and able to examine two sides of the coin, I am simply examining the right side and looking for justice. While this amendment may not meet all the legal requirements of the minister, it does satisfy the consciences of most of us, and I would say his conscience also. I know he is bound by some tentacles which hang on to him pretty firmly or else he would agree to accept this.

How in the world can we sit in this chamber and not give the justice that we should to those people to whom we have denied the right of escalation according to the increase in the consumer price index since 1966? This is not right; it is not fair. We are asking for fairness so that these people may know they have been justly treated. The longer I sit in this chamber and watch governments, Mr. Speaker, the more I see a tendency to cheat. I know that in balancing things, decisions have to be made. A government has to cut expenses somewhere or else increase taxes. The present case demands simple justice. The amount of money necessary would be small. I am no economist but under the present proposal old age pensioners are being cheated out of about \$10 a month. It is time we took steps to rectify that.

I would ask the minister to support me right down the line on this amendment. If necessary, the bill should go back to committee to provide that no order will be made under subsection (1) until the proposed text of that order has been laid before the House by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada. Surely this amend-

[Mr. Munro.]

ment is in order, both from the legal standpoint and the conscience standpoint, and so I move it, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The Chair has no motion in front of it.

**Mr. Rynard:** Mr. Speaker, I was trying to save time by not reading it all. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin):

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

"Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be referred back to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs with an instruction to consider the advisability of inserting therein the following clause:

(1) The Governor in Council may, by order, increase the Old Age Security pension so as to reflect the full increase in the Consumer Price Index since the 1st January 1967 to date with adjustments to the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

(2) No order may be made under subsection (1) until the proposed text of the order has been laid before the House of Commons by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and the making of the order has been approved by a resolution of the House of Commons.

(3) Expenditures required under an order made under subsection (1) shall be paid for out of moneys to be appropriated by Parliament.' "

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. I think this would be the right time to invite hon. members to comment on the acceptability of the amendment. I have to question a certain aspect of it, but before rendering a decision I would invite hon. members to comment. This, of course, would include the hon. member for Peace River who has already made some comment on it.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I made my argument at the wrong time. It was because I came into the House hurriedly after attending to important business, and I thought we had reached this stage of the bill. However, no harm has been done. It may be that what I said in advance will have convinced the Chair and the Chair's advisers and, if so, I have nothing more to add.

• (1630)

**Mr. Deachman:** Mr. Speaker, may we have a copy of the motion please?

**Mr. Baldwin:** It is very simple.

**Mr. Munro:** We are having some difficulty with the writing, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has a copy that he could let us have so that we can be certain of the wording.

**Mr. Baldwin:** We only had three copies, Mr. Speaker. We thought it would be accepted without any argument, so we do not have any more copies available.

**Mr. Munro:** I wonder if I might ask the hon. member for Peace River to look at his copy. I am reading the amendment and five lines down it reads "consider the advisability of inserting". Then, he has crossed out "inserting the following" and put in something else. Can he tell me what he inserted there?