

talk a lot about what they are prepared to do for old age pensioners—they are willing to set aside the business of the House to deal with the question of pensions, and so on. I do not know what we shall get from the Liberals. But it has been promised that the increase will be substantial. The pension amounts to \$82.88 at the present time. We shall have to decide, when we get the bill, what “substantial” means. But at least there is a clear indication from that side of the House that we will get something. There is no indication from the Progressive Conservative party that they will do anything at all beyond \$10 a month.

The hon. member for Yukon wants to know whether we would vote those people out and put him and his friends in on the basis of their \$10 a month.

Mr. Nielsen: Oh no, that was not the question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): While the hon. member is trying to formulate his question, may I say that I hope the question by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) got on record in *Hansard*. He wants to know if we have found the money for \$150 a month, which is a clear indication that he does not favour the \$150. There is one thing about the hon. member for Edmonton West: he honestly states the position of his party. And he is not in favour of the \$150.

Mr. Nielsen: May I address my question again to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I ask both hon. members to resume their seats. Since the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is not prepared to yield to the hon. member for Yukon, the hon. member for Yukon cannot be recognized.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was prepared to yield. I just wanted first to comment on the interjection from the hon. member for Edmonton West. I am quite happy to take a question from the hon. member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: My question to the hon. member—and he appeared to miss it, judging from the breadth of his comments—was this: if the government does not act as suggested, and bring in by Monday legislation along the lines he proposes, are he and his party prepared to vote against the appropriation bill? This would have the effect of turfing out the government, but not necessarily of putting this party in power.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We shall be happy to let the Official Opposition know our strategy when it is time to make it known. The hon. member cannot get away with these indirect questions. He tries to tie the question whether or not we get the notice by tomorrow to the way in which we shall vote on the supply bill. The question of the supply bill stands on its own. We happen to think that this parliament should be made to work. We happen to think that the business of government should carry on.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Don't evade the question.

Supply

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Just a minute; I did not come here yesterday. You can't get me that way. If the government lets us down on old age pensions we will deal with the government when we decide to do so, and in the right way. But that is a different thing from withholding this money which is intended for unemployment insurance payments, LIP payments, New Horizon programs, fitness and amateur sport and all the other things.

Mr. Danforth: Money for agriculture?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, money for agriculture. The hon. member for Yukon does not know about western farmers. We are not like hon. members to our right. We are not prepared, as they are, to attempt to bring a halt to the ongoing business of government just in the hope that they might get over there on the treasury benches and make a worse mess than is being made by hon. members sitting there at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I can congratulate the hon. members from the Conservative party for curtailing the week's filibuster they had planned to carry on with respect to these nine motions, so that we may get at the supply bill today or Monday. But I say to them that the supply bill stands on its own feet. It represents the ongoing business of government. There are the programs in it which I have mentioned, and which need to be financed, and we intend to vote for each of these items.

Mr. Hees: We know how you feel. Do not bother with the alibis.

• (1440)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Do not talk to me about alibis; my friends make them by the thousands. We are not going to vote for reducing the “New Horizons” item to \$1. We are not going to vote for reducing the fitness and amateur sport item to \$1. We are not going to vote for reducing the agricultural items or any of the others. We think the business of government must go on, and therefore we are prepared to vote this money. However, we are saying to the government—and I think the government knows this—that they have to act on pensions in a proper way or they know what will happen.

Mr. Barnett J. Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise to participate in this debate. In fact, when I come to think of it, it doesn't give me very great pleasure, since the purpose of the motions proposed by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is to delay funds for very worthwhile programs, something that I do not approve. If the hon. member would pause to think about it when he comes back into the chamber, the effect of his proposals would be to kill these programs.

Let us think for a moment what these programs really do. They are extremely worthwhile. The hon. member opposite is sitting down at the far end of the chamber trying to make deals with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and is playing little games with the lives of senior citizens. There is one of those organic relationships going on down there at the moment.