

Canada Assistance Plan

the motion is so different from the character of the motion moved in January that it withdraws it from the operation of the rule which is set out in citation 163 and citation 200, as well as the rule set out in several other authorities. I am quite familiar with that rule.

I contend that this house cannot regard a motion one way in January and another way in June. What we had before us in January, so this house decided, was a motion of confidence or non-confidence in the government. If that was the case, let it stand that way. We now have a motion before us having to do with the amount of the old age pension.

There is a third argument I thought the Minister of National Health and Welfare would use. I did my homework and I was ready for it.

Mr. MacEachen: There are several more.

Mr. Knowles: Perhaps I will be told that since the minister did not raise this argument I should not set forth an answer to it, but I raise it because it is an argument which I think is on our side of the case. I refer to our rights in moving an amendment on second reading of a bill. This is set out in several places, but succinctly in citation 382 at page 277 of *Beauchesne's* fourth edition. This citation has been put in *Hansard* on a good many occasions, but perhaps I should put it on the record again. It reads as follows:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

The latter part of that has no relevance at this time, but I do not like to read a citation without putting all of it on the record.

● (4:00 p.m.)

You will have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that in reading that citation I tried by my tone of voice to emphasize the number of places where the word "or" appears. This citation does not say that an amendment on second reading has to do all these things, or even any two of them. It says it can do any one of several things. My amendment reads as follows:

That Bill C-207 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this

house the government should give consideration to the immediate introduction of concurrent legislation providing for an old age pension of \$100 a month, without a means or needs test, for all persons 65 years of age and over.

I submit that this comes within one or more of the rights set out in citation 382. The amendment suggests that I am opposed to proceeding with this bill in its present form until the house has had the opportunity to declare that in principle it believes there should be concurrent legislation dealing with another matter, namely old age, by raising the pension to \$100 a month.

There are several things that can be done in such an amendment. It can differ from the principle, policy or provisions of the bill. My amendment differs on one point, on the point of how to deal with old age. It can express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction of the bill. That in the main is what my amendment does; it objects to the Canada Assistance Plan being presented to us without our being given at the same time—and I welcome the support of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) in the question asked on the orders of the day today—legislation dealing with the need to raise the old age pension to \$100 a month.

I am not opposed to Bill C-207 per se; I am not opposed to the bill itself; but I am opposed to its being proceeded with, without there being at the same time legislation—my amendment asks for concurrent legislation—to increase the old age pension to \$100 a month. Therefore, because it seems to me that I have been able to give effective answers to the two points raised by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, because I have been able to establish our right to move such an amendment by relying on citation 382, I trust that Your Honour will find the amendment in order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go over the various points raised by the hon. member who preceded me. Suffice it to say that in January, when the amendment was moved by me to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the stand taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) was that his opposition to it was based on the fact that it was a vote of non-confidence. At page 59 of *Hansard* the following appears:

I will explain to the house why we on this side cannot accept this vote of non-confidence.

The right hon. gentleman—

That was referring to me.