

ly, without inquiry, once they have reached the age of 60, \$200 a month without any supplement. Thus, Mr. Speaker, and for the sake of consistency, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne):

That Bill C-207, an Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be not now read for the third time but be referred instead to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs for the purpose of considering the advisability of:

- (a) Lowering to age 60 eligibility for the old age security pension;
- (b) Granting the old age pension to every person, even if his age is lower than the provisions of the present act, whose spouse receives a monthly pension by virtue of the said act.
- (c) Abolishing the concept of the supplement and fixing the basic amount at \$200 a month.

—and \$150 a month for the spouse under 60.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member could perhaps indicate, for the information of the Chair, if he feels that this amendment is acceptable according to Standing Orders. The hon. member will admit that an almost identical amendment was moved a few moments ago by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). My colleague, the hon. member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Laniel), who was occupying the Chair at that moment, outlined the precedents and referred to the Standing Orders applicable in such cases. I am afraid that his decision then is also applicable on all counts to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

However, I would be happy to listen to any comments on the matter.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to refer you, in support of this motion, to citation 415(2) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms which reads as follows:

Bills may be recommitted a number of times with or without limitation; in the latter case, the whole bill is opened to reconsideration, but in the former case the Committee can only consider the clause or amendments or instructions referred to them. When material amendments are desirable, the order for the third reading may be discharged, and the bill recommitted to introduce the amendments in Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to base my argument on that paragraph to which I will come back in part.

Yesterday, as you will recall, we brought in an amendment tending to refer Bill C-2 to the standing committee on justice and legal affairs so that section 44 be completely deleted from the bill. Your colleague ruled that the amendment we brought in yesterday called for a redrafting of section 44, which was not the case, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment we moved yesterday tended only to delete this paragraph from the section.

Along the same line, Mr. Speaker, we attack the bill in its third reading without any limitation. I quote from the citation:

Bills may be recommitted a number of times with or without limitation, in the latter case, the whole bill is opened to reconsideration;

The motion that I move, seconded by my colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska, tends to question the very principle of the bill, its philosophy, not the principle of granting financial assistance to old people, but the one under which the basic payment and the guaranteed income supplement are established.

Old Age Security Act

Then, Mr. Speaker, we question the age factor. The bill provides for the payment of a pension to any person who reaches age 65. I ask that the committee examine the possibility of lowering the statutory age to 60.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for an escalation of this pension in line with the increase in the cost of living, for the single person as well as for married couples.

The bill does not provide for the payment of a pension to the spouse of the old age security pensioner.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) pointed out, there is some flexibility in the bill itself which will allow for an increase in the pensions.

My motion is to the same effect and in the same spirit. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is relevant since it is substantive, since it deals with the principle of the bill and is non-limiting.

I shall repeat in concluding what you have so well understood, and I am positive about it: Whenever a bill is to be referred, the whole bill may be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I am after, so that our senior citizens in Canada may get true income security instead of some fictitious social security.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre addressing himself to the point of order?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker I rise to say only a brief word. I like the substance of this amendment much better than the substance of the amendment we had a while ago. I argued that it should have been in order, but we lost on the ground that it went a little beyond what was in the bill. All I can say with regard to this amendment is that if I had thought it was possible at this stage to bring in an amendment to provide for a substantial increase in the amount of the pension, to lower the eligible age and to provide benefits for spouses who are younger, you would have had such an amendment from me long ago.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his comments. I am rather suspicious that perhaps this is exactly what would have happened.

[*Translation*]

I also wish to thank the hon. member for Lotbinière for his comments.

I am afraid the hon. member has failed to differentiate between the two types of amendments: the one which allows the House to consider the suggestion that a bill be referred to a committee for one of its sections to be re-examined or reconsidered, and the other one which is called reasoned amendment in English and which is used by a member to indicate why he intends to vote against the principle of the bill.

The reasoned amendment here gives a detailed account of the reasons why the hon. member intends to vote against the bill as such on second or third reading. There is no question then of referring the bill to a committee but simply of saying why the House should vote against the bill as such.