

*Old Age Security*

\$10 is to be paid, a plan whereby the promise that there would be no additional taxation is being completely changed.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, as you will recall, the promise was that the payments would be made as a result of levies on industry, on labour, and in the manner indicated in accordance with the plan previously announced. Now every person in this country who earns wages is to be taxed. This comes as passing strange from a government which was going to bring about a reduction of taxation; no increases. The first thing it does when it is circumvented as a result of its failure to consult the provinces in advance is to bring in this legislation in the form of a resolution. Why, one could almost call it the second of the budgets brought down by this government. It provides for taxation, and it places the house in the position of either accepting the taxation or of being misinterpreted as being opposed to the \$10 increase.

That is the reason the resolution is phrased in this form. We have had experience, since the present government took office, in dating things back to April 8, and I feel the committee would like the opportunity to ensure that the promises and undertakings made to the old people of this country by the present government will in fact be carried out. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith):

That the said resolution be amended by striking out the words "effective October 1, 1963" in line three thereof, and substituting therefor "and this house asks that the government give consideration to making the payment of such additional pension to commence as of April 8, 1963".

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Mr. Chairman, before Your Honour puts the motion may I say I do not think there is any need for an extended debate but I do want to ask Your Honour to consider whether or not the amendment is in order or is simply a colourable device to ask the house to do something which no one who is not actually a minister of the crown has the constitutional right to do. We know that the right hon. gentleman who moved the amendment has not got used yet to being on the other side of the house—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. Member:** What about your promises?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** —but I submit to Your Honour that this would impose an additional charge upon the exchequer or it means nothing at all. If it means nothing at all it should not be before the committee and if it means an additional charge, that cannot be done without a message from the crown.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Chairman, I will answer that immediately. No additional charge will be imposed by the wording we have used namely, "this house asks that the government give consideration to making the payment of such additional pension to commence as of April 8, 1963". We do not direct them to do it. We suggest that they give consideration to it. That is all we are asking, and I say that the amendment comes within the rules.

**The Chairman:** The amendment proposed by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is, of course, very close to the one moved on July 18 last on which your chairman has had the opportunity to prepare a ruling, although I have never had the occasion to submit it to the committee. At that time I gave serious thought to the problem and since then I have continued to give serious thought and consideration to this type of amendment.

I must say that my feeling is very much along the lines of the argument and thoughts expressed by the Secretary of State. If this amendment means something it must be a charge on the treasury and if it means nothing I am in agreement with the suggestion of the Secretary of State that we have nothing on which to rule. If it means something it is a charge on the treasury, and on that basis I have to rule, with great regret, that the amendment is out of order.

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal your ruling.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker** resumed the chair, and the chairman of the committee made the following report:

The question is as follows: During discussion in committee of the whole on a resolution to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Leader of the Opposition moved the following amendment:

"That the said resolution be amended by striking out the words 'effective October 1, 1963' in line 3 thereof and substituting therefor 'and this house asks that the government give consideration to making the payment of such additional pension to commence as of April 8, 1963'."

The chairman ruled that the amendment was out of order on the ground that if there is substance to the amendment as proposed it is a charge on the treasury and could not therefore be proposed at this time.

From this ruling, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) appealed. Is it the pleasure of the house that the chairman's ruling be confirmed?

The house divided on the question: Shall the ruling of the chairman be confirmed? And the ruling was confirmed on the following division: