

before me and this motion is the one which has to be considered by the House this afternoon.

As to the second point, the point which was raised by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and to some extent by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, I suggest it would be difficult for the Chair to rule that this is not properly a non-confidence motion and to treat it as an ordinary motion under the terms of the relevant Standing Order. I have some sympathy for the point raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and reinforced by the President of the Privy Council. This motion does appear, on the face of it, to be a substantive motion or even a private member's resolution; it does not indicate that by a vote hon. members would be expressing non-confidence in the government.

It seems to me I ought to remind hon. members that a number of similar motions have been before us in the past, motions which could have been interpreted as being substantive motions rather than as motions expressing want of confidence. It may well be that in future the Chair should look at this matter more closely. My impression, without having gone into the situation in detail, is that motions of no-confidence, or motions alleged to be motions of no-confidence within the terms of Standing Order 58(9) have been put to the House before, in this form, and have been considered under that Standing Order and voted upon at the expiry of the debate at 9.45 p.m. This is my impression. I would have to go over the precedents and see whether I am right or not. In the meantime, I think this motion should be put in the terms in which it has been presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and be considered as a motion under Standing Order 58(9).

This having been said, I should like myself to enter a caveat. The matter will be looked into a little more closely, and perhaps the next time the Chair is presented with a motion which purports to be a non-confidence motion there will be an indication on the part of the Chair that it should clearly be a non-confidence motion rather than an expression of feeling or opinion in the form of a substantive motion or of a private member's resolution such as this one appears to be. There has been some difficulty in connection with the present motion and I suggest we allow the debate to go ahead on its present basis, reserving the position both as far as the Official Opposition is concerned and as far as the

*Old Age and Veterans' Pensions*

Chair is concerned. It might be very useful for the House leaders to hold discussions on the subject, and the Chair will take the initiative in this regard.

**Mr. Aiken:** May I comment on one observation which has been made by Your Honour in connection with Standing Order 58(4)(b)? It would, of course, have been possible for the Official Opposition to have filed a counter motion under this provision so that Your Honour would have been called upon to make a decision. However, we had made an agreement that this should be a day allotted to the NDP and we did not feel that we would be carrying out our agreement if we tried to block their motion.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I present this motion today on behalf of the New Democratic Party, not just as another motion on the question of old age pensions and the pensions and allowances of our war veterans; I present this motion because I believe the situation is fast becoming one of emergency and that the time has come for this House to call on the government to take action in these two fields. In view of the discussion that has just taken place on a point of order or two, I shall rearrange the remarks that I was going to make and say at this point something that I had intended as my peroration. I refer to the question of whether or not this motion really is one of non-confidence.

I quite deliberately avoided using the words "this House condemns the government" for such and such a thing because I know that there have been over the years a number of non-confidence motions, particularly in the days when there were supply motions which the opposition sought to amend, which expressed views which the government was prepared to accept; and when the government accepted those views, saying it had no objection to the motion that had been presented, the non-confidence motion lost its non-confidence character. That is precisely the reason for wording the motion in the way it has been worded. It is my hope that the government will say that it agrees with what is said in the motion. It is my hope that the government will agree that it is now time to deal with these two groups of pensions, and that it will therefore permit the House to pass the motion unanimously at 9.45 this evening.

As I say, there have been a number of instances—true, not since we changed the