

preceding that in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on the order paper be allowed to stand.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks you have just made, I might add that the solution is very simple. One merely needs to consider carefully the provisions of Standing Order 19(1) which reads as follows:

Questions put by members and notices of motions, not taken up when called may (upon the request of the government) be allowed to stand and retain their precedence; otherwise they will disappear from the order paper.

Under these circumstances, if I have to rise each time at five p.m. to ask that notices of motions and public bills in the name of hon. members on the order paper be allowed to stand, because some hon. members are not ready to proceed, I shall certainly do so to by-pass the difficulty, but I feel that practices exist in the House, and that the activities of the House are not governed solely by our standing orders, but also by the practice of the House. May I therefore bring to Your Honour's attention the fact that, when you consider this issue and before rendering your decision, you take into account that sometimes the practice of the House may prevent useless procedural nightmares.

[English]

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding from the remarks which have just been made that the ten members who have motions on the order paper prior to the motion which is now to be called have declined to proceed today, those ten members having put their motions on the order paper on October 27 of this year?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am not in a position to answer the question of the hon. member.

[Translation]

Perhaps I might point out to the parliamentary secretary that indeed one of the reasons why the decision cannot be given today is that the precedents are not clear, at least the past practices of the House in that respect are not clear. The procedure now followed by the government to organize the working schedule for the member's hour is a new procedure dating from the last session. It must be considered not only in the light of the last session but also in the light of past experiences and this leads us to inconsistent practices which can be challenged by hon. members, including the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert), and if the parliamentary secretary would allow me to complete my comments in the other language for the benefit of the hon. member for Vaudreuil—

[English]

I would want to reserve the matter particularly since there are contradictions in past experience and practices and this is a new procedure which commenced in the last session, based not on previous usage of the two Standing Orders or past practices. This is why the Chair wants to take a deeper look at the question, especially since the hon. member for Vaudreuil is questioning the right of the government to intervene more or

less on a permanent basis in organizing the work of private members' hour.

It is a question of opinion perhaps, but I think it is a worth-while point and should be taken seriously. It would also be useful for hon. members to do some thinking on the matter and even to discuss it with the Chair, so there can be a good contribution to the procedural debate which will be invited the next time the House reaches notices of motions in private members' hour.

Motions Nos. 2 to 13 having been stood at the request of the government, the House will proceed to the consideration of motion No. 14 appearing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

OLD AGE SECURITY

SUGGESTION PENSION BE PAID TO PERSONS AT AGE 60 UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of amending the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan to provide for the pensions payable under these two acts to be available at age 60 to all persons who meet the other requirements of the said acts and who are not in or are prepared to withdraw from the labour market, and also to provide for the basic amount of the pension payable under the Old Age Security Act, at age 60 for those not in the labour market and to everyone at age 65, to be increased to \$300 per month, for this basic amount to be escalated each year by an amount that will enable pensioners not only to keep up with rising living costs but to share in rising living standards, and also to provide for the elimination of any means or income test from the Old Age Security Act, so that the full pension thereunder will be recognized as the established right of all our people.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are telling me that just about everything I need to say has already been said from the Chair in the reading of the motion. Perhaps I should just say that those are my sentiments and then sit down, hoping that my motion might come to a vote. My experience in this House leads me to believe that this would not be the result if I were to sit down. Even though the likelihood is that this private member's motion will get the usual treatment in that it will be talked out, I hope that the discussing of this subject today and the contributions that will be made to it by those who get the floor will help emphasize the point that the time has come to make some real improvements in our legislation respecting our senior citizens.

This afternoon when the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras) was speaking to another matter before the House, he drew attention to the large amount of money out of the federal treasury which goes into our various social programs. So what is wrong with that? As a matter of fact, a moment later he said that there was reluctance to cut back any of those programs because they affect individuals, persons whom we know, and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, that very statement underlines my point that there is no better purpose for a government to have than to improve the life of the people who make up this country. When I say "people," I include all our people both young and old. But surely one of the things which we can do with all the great wealth which we produce in this country—I agree with the President of the Treasury