

Canada Assistance Plan

then. The amendment moved then was substantially the same as that now moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Turner) referred to a judgment given by Mr. Speaker Michener, and which makes sense, but perhaps not in the same way as it was referred to by the minister. I would like to quote a different part of that judgment which was reported in the *Journals* of January 23, 1958, at page 366:

If the principle of the bill is opposed, and some other proper disposition of the bill is moved by way of amendment, then that is in order. But this amendment—

The Speaker was referring to an amendment moved at that time which, in my view, was very similar to the one we now have under consideration.

—does not seek to dispose of the bill at all. It simply calls upon the house to start, *de novo*, with some other proceedings, presumably to consider bringing in another bill... Hence in my view the amendment is not in order as it stands.

In view of these arguments I have no alternative except, with great regret, to refuse the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and to say that on procedural grounds it is out of order.

Mr. Knowles: I share your regret, sir.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, now that all these points of order have been disposed of, we have probably lost more time than if we had discussed the amendment. Even though our procedures did not permit the amendment to be moved, nevertheless that does not remove the urgent need for such a piece of legislation to be introduced.

This bill, No. C-207, concerns one of the main principles of any society, the basic human rights of the individual. I agree with what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said yesterday, that the Liberal government has the ability to introduce legislation which flatters you on one side, and on the other hand more or less slaps you on the back of the head. This is a typical example, concerning our aged people and their needs for a higher pension to cope with the rising cost of living.

There are good points in the bill, and some points that should have been developed more. It should include greater protection for individual needs. I also agree with what the

[Mr. Speaker.]

hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said yesterday, that all people in this country have the same equal rights to live. This applies to children as well as to the aged, to needy mothers as well as veterans. Each individual has a basic right to live, but to live he must have the necessary means and income.

There are three basic categories in this country, those who earn the means to live by their labour, those who live on the interest derived from capital investment, and a third group who have neither the capacity for labour nor enjoy the privilege of living on capital. What is this third group to do? These are the people covered by this bill, and the aged are included in them. Under the terms of this bill the government is now placing them under public assistance. This is a public assistance act.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raynald Guay (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Certainly.

Mr. Guay: Does the hon. member believe that people aged 70 with a \$10,000 annual income should have their old age pensions increased at this time?

Mr. Langlois: Mr. Speaker, that is not the problem which I referred to. Perhaps the hon. member gave another interpretation to my remarks, but, in any event, I said that there are different categories of people: those with income derived from a job; then those with income derived from capital investments.

Then, the example just given by the hon. member is included in those categories.

I refer to the aged citizen who cannot earn a living for himself either through work, or through capital investments. He has nothing left but old age assistance.

And Mr. Speaker, I do not like the inclusion of the old age pension, which is a right. I do not like it when those people who gave the best of their lives for their country are now to be included in an assistance plan. Out of respect for them, they should be granted a special status in Canadian legislation.

[*English*]

I see it is five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Not yet.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I thank hon. members for not seeing the clock. Yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre