

*Interim Supply*

connection with the case which indicates the matter was referred to his department. I do not say it was referred to the minister specifically but it was dealt with by the R.C.M.P. They expressed their sympathy but said there was no legal obligation in the matter. Naturally, therefore, I brought it to the attention of the house tonight.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, I am sure all members of the house will feel that the hon. member for Kamloops has brought to our attention a case that deserves not only our sympathy but positive action along the lines that the member suggested, and I am sure we are all grateful to the Minister of Justice for his assurance that he will give this matter his attention.

I should like to say on behalf of our party that we are prepared to grant to the government the two months interim supply that is being asked for tonight. This is a routine request which has been made with the usual assurance that we will have the fullest opportunity later in the session to discuss the items, portions of which we are voting at this time.

As hon. members are aware, an interim supply debate is one that is rather wide open. We are free to discuss any of the matters towards which we vote money. But it is not my intention to make a wide-ranging speech at this hour of Friday night or at this stage of the session. I should like, rather, to say a few words about the part of the session we have had thus far, and to indicate what I feel is the most disappointing feature of it. I imagine that in the next week or two the newspapers and periodicals of the country will run editorials and feature articles about this session. It will be interesting to see what adjectives they use, and what titles they give to it. There are a number of things that have happened that will, of course, receive their attention as they try to assess the value of what we have done.

I believe the most disappointing aspect of the session that we have had up to this point, these first 56 days, is the failure to get something definite done with regard to the increase in the amount of the old age pension. If there is one thing that was discussed on just about every platform during the election that was held last spring, it was the question of raising the amount of the old age pension, and of providing other ways of increasing old age security generally. All parties were committed to do something in this field. Certainly, the party that won the election was one that had made very strong commitments. I was so aware of that commitment that, in my own case, on election night in my committee rooms I expressed to my followers

[Mr. Willoughby.]

who were there the belief that whatever other mistakes might be made by the government that was elected that night, we would be able to get out of it in this parliament an early increase in the old age pension.

When we came down and heard the speech from the throne, we were informed of the proposal to introduce the Canada pension plan. After a while we got the resolution on the order paper. We had the newspaper reports of speeches made outside of the house by the Minister of National Health and Welfare. We were assured that in due course we would get not only a new piece of pension legislation known as the Canada pension plan, but an increase of \$10 in the pension paid to those who draw pensions under the Old Age Security Act. Despite the fact that there have been these evidences that it is going to happen, it is most disappointing to us in this house, and even more disappointing to those who are affected throughout the country, that the effective date of that increase has been put off until, so far as we can find out, some time in 1964.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare when she was speaking on this subject, said the effective date of the increase would be early in 1964. I was pleased the Prime Minister said to me the other day that the effective date might be earlier than I feared. This is an interesting use of the word "fear". I can only hope that since the Minister of National Health and Welfare said some time early in 1964 and the Prime Minister used the word "earlier", that does at least give some credence to the newspaper reports that we can count on the date of January 1.

However, Mr. Chairman, the old people of Canada do not feel that is good enough. It does seem to me we should have some clear statement from the government before we wind up tonight as to when that \$10 increase is to be made effective. A couple of times during this session the Prime Minister said that we could get along with these things if other business were out of the way. I think he realized that was really a bluff, and a couple of times he realized his bluff was called. Actually, the government has not been prepared to move with this piece of legislation in this part of the session. But it does seem to me now, before we wind up tonight, we should be told what that effective date is going to be.

We have been promised that the resolution on the Canada pension plan, which was started, will be called as early as possible after we come back in September. I see no reason why it should take any length of time at all to get that resolution and that bill through this house. If we get it through in the early part of October, as I am sure we