

Messrs:

Pringle	St. Pierre
Reid	Tolmie
Robinson	Trudel
Rochon	Turner
Roy (Timmins)	(London East)
Roy (Laval)	Turner
Serré	(Ottawa-Carleton)
Sharp	Wahn
Smith	Walker
(Northumberland- Miramichi)	Watson
Smith	Weatherhead
(Saint-Jean)	Whelan
Stafford	Whiting
Stanbury	Yanakis—105.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost. Since there has been a vote in the negative on motion No. 1, it will not be necessary to vote on motion No. 3.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved:

That Bill C-202, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, be concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Munro** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

**Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth-Wilmot):** Mr. Speaker, just before ten o'clock I was somewhat frightened, as I believe the leader of the House was, that the minister was going to talk out his own bill. Then I heard a whisper between him and one of his colleagues.

The minister, in his remarks, drew attention to what the government was doing for one class of old age pension recipients. We are not denying this, Mr. Speaker. We favour increasing the income supplement. What we have been complaining about is that the basic pension would no longer carry provision for an automatic 2 per cent increase in line with increases in the cost of living. The minister said that those who are receiving the guaranteed income supplement will as of right receive the additional amount after reporting their income. This will hold true for a certain category of pensioners as of April 1 next, but it will not be true for pensioners in other categories. Those who are receiving the basic pension will not receive as of right the 2 per cent increment which other pension recipients will be receiving. This is the point the minister did not answer when my honourable friend from Huron (Mr. McKinley) posed his question. Members of this House have pleaded with the minister to give consideration to pensioners who will receive \$80 as is proposed.

These pensioners are being discriminated against in another way. The fact is, as was pointed out by the minister in committee, that any shortfall due to an increase in the cost of living will be picked up by the

### Old Age Security Act

recipients of the guaranteed income supplement. This is not so in the case of recipients of the basic pension. The minister, in his comments at the report stage, indicated that all kinds of money would be required.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The Chair invites honourable members who wish to carry on conversations to do so outside the House, in order to permit interested members to follow the speech of the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot (Mr. Monteith).

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

• (10:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Monteith:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I found myself yelling pretty loudly in order to be heard above the turmoil in the House. However, I appreciate that the hour is late. I simply point out that apart from one small contribution from across the way in defence of the minister, which I do not think was too important, all the members who have spoken from the opposition benches today have pleaded with the minister that he reconsider our thoughts on the matter as well as the rights of the recipients of the basic pension. As a consequence, I propose to give the minister one more opportunity for a second thought about this very serious step that he is taking. This bill departs from the principle of universality that the old age pension has carried with it since its inception in 1950 or 1952, a principle that was the unanimous recommendation of an all-party committee. I suggest such departure is a very dangerous one.

I appreciate this principle was departed from when the guaranteed income supplement was originally brought in, but we are here taking a further discriminatory step by putting these people into a certain class which will not receive the cost of living increment. Therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted:

"Bill C-202, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be not now read the third time as this House is opposed to a bill which fails to include any adequate cost of living provision in respect of the basic amount of the monthly pension".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. Having read the amendment put by the hon. member for Perth-Wilmot, the Chair feels it should consider it procedurally. The motion would postpone third reading of the bill and at the same time seems to impose a condition thereon. Consequently, the Chair might want to do some reading on the matter.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief in case the Chair intends to dream on this amendment tonight. We are simply declaring a principle adverse to the bill. The bill does not contain this aspect that we feel is essential. We are not attaching a condition to the bill; we are simply declaring that the bill is to this extent repugnant to us, not in its entirety but simply because it fails to contain this provision. I think this is the basis upon which the hon. member has moved his very sensible