

Old Age Security Act

a certain purchasing power from the old age pensioners of today and tomorrow.

My leader spoke about constant dollars in his speech on the budget debate on Monday. If we look at this bill from a constant dollar point of view, we find that the value of the dollar the government pays to a recipient of old age security when he qualifies at age 65 is less than it was when he contributed through taxes, in spite of the clause proposed by the government containing the 3½ per cent escalation. It could well be that the escalation in the cost of living will be twice as high as the 3½ per cent stipulated by the government. This is exactly the same situation as that in respect of the 3 per cent perpetual bonds, through which the government is robbing the people of this country blind.

What the hon. member for Simcoe North is suggesting to the contributors to the old age security fund is that we will recognize that they are contributing constant dollars toward old age security and that they will receive constant dollars. In other words, the dollars contributed toward old age security will be of the same value as the dollars received when they qualify for old age security. That is our commitment to the old age security recipient now and in the future. That is what we are interested in and that is the reason we have proposed this amendment.

It may be that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) could suggest another method of doing the same thing. Our difficulty is that, in endeavouring to propose amendments to a piece of government legislation, you must take the legislation as you find it and amend it in the best way you can. I believe the hon. member for Simcoe North has endeavoured to do that. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has a better idea as to how this can be done, and if he proposes such a way, I know that the hon. member for Simcoe North will, as will every other hon. member of the Conservative party, support such an amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Would you vote for a \$150 basic pension?

Mr. Coates: I am not opposed to that.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Just your leader.

Mr. Coates: I am speaking for myself right now. What I am saying is that we would like to see the old age security recipient in this country receive justice. He is not going to receive justice under this legislation, nor will he receive it when getting an extra \$2.80 per month. There are ways and means, and certainly sufficient funds, to see that these recipients do get justice. I cannot for the life of me understand why this government is not willing to give the old age security recipients what they need and have a right to receive. I do not believe the government's proposal will accomplish that, but I believe that the amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Simcoe North is a step in the right direction. It could meet the situation if properly applied. There may be other ways of doing this, and I do not argue with that. There is always more than one way to accomplish something. I suggest that this amendment would provide a more equitable deal for the old age recipients of this country than the proposition contained in the legislation now before us.

[Mr. Coates.]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of listening to the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) and of reading the clause of the bill the hon. member would choose to amend. I must say I fail to see what significance the amendment will have. The clause of the bill states what, in fact, the escalation is to be. The effect of the hon. member's amendment would be to make this escalation not less than what it is in fact to be. I question what impact this would have.

That being my view, I do not intend to go into the substance of some of the allegations, comments and observations of the hon. member and others. If they are relevant, I think it is not with reference to this particular amendment but rather to third reading, and I will be more than happy to take advantage of my opportunity of rebuttal on third reading, if these views are expressed again at that particular time.

• (1610)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I declare the motion negated on division.

Motion No. 5 (Mr. Rynard) negated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Before I render a decision on motion No. 7 put forward by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), perhaps I should give notice of the first impression of the Chair regarding the acceptability of this motion. In my opinion, it would require additional expenditure on the part of the Crown and on this basis I would have difficulty in accepting the motion. If hon. members have opinions on the acceptability of that motion I would like to hear them. Otherwise, I will make a decision at this time.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is fair that I should argue this one.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You won when you did not argue.

Mr. Baldwin: Perhaps, on the hon. member's suggestion, if I sit down the Chair might decide in my favour. If I could receive some indications from the Chair to that effect, I would be glad to sit down right away.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you look closely at this motion you will see that it is not a direction. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) as reported in yesterday's *Hansard* at page 2326, used these words in dealing