

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, only I see no resemblance to the Lord on the government side. The members over there may think they are lords, but the facts are different. I am speaking about the situation as it is at present. Even with the present guaranteed income supplement for persons between the ages of 65 and 70, once those persons get that supplement they are over the income tax exemption level and, instead of getting the net guarantee that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is supposed to give them, they obtain something less, because his dear friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), comes along with his tax. Under the new levels, the situation will be even worse.

Is the minister rising to make an announcement?

**Mr. Munro:** No. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes.

**Mr. Munro:** The hon. member a little while ago said that he did not like the recommendation in the bill to make the guaranteed income supplement program permanent. He did not like it because it perpetuated distinctions between the aged people, between the ones who actually need the supplementation and the ones who do not and who receive only the old age security pension. Really, what I am asking the hon. member is this: is it his position that he would like to do away with the guaranteed income supplement program entirely? If he does not wish to make this program permanent or if he wishes to have it phased out, does he think that the money that would otherwise be put in this area should assist the old age pensioner generally in a completely universal coverage? My second question is this: would he then still be prepared to recommend only \$100 as the limit for all pensioners in the country?

**Mr. Gilbert:** The minister has missed the point, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I thought the minister was listening intently to me.

**Mr. Munro:** I was.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** May I answer his first question by saying categorically, yes, I should like to go back to the completely universal program. I realize that I do not have the support of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) on that, but I think I could win him over if I could spend some time with him. Yes, I should like to go back to the completely universal program, and I would collect more by way of income tax from that 10 per cent of the population that is at the top of the income scale. I see the minister shaking his head.

**Mr. Munro:** The hon. member knows very well how much he would get.

**Mr. Peters:** There is plenty of money here.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is running out. Surely, you will allow me the two minutes that the minister took. I come back

### *Old Age Security Act*

to his question. If all we are going to do is merely redistribute the amounts now given to the older people, of course we cannot do it; but if we are prepared to consider the Canadian family as a unit and if we are prepared to redistribute our total wealth in terms of justice and fairness to our older people, we can do it.

May I answer the second part of the minister's question? He asked me if I still support a pension of \$100 a month.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Could I have a couple of minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** It will be necessary for the hon. member to obtain the unanimous consent of the House, because his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Does the House agree unanimously to allowing the hon. member to complete his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members of the House. I shall not abuse their kindness. I thought I made it clear to the minister and to the House in the first sentence or two of my remarks this afternoon that, in my opinion, what should be before the House is a bill providing for \$150 across the board. Back in 1966 we were asking for \$100 a month, yes; but we are asking for \$150 a month across the board. That is the position I take, that my party takes, and that is the position that I think would make sense so far as the people of this nation are concerned. I say again that if we attempt to put the old people off to one side by themselves and stir around and redistribute the resources that we make available to them, it cannot be done. On the other hand, if we take an over-all, comprehensive view of Canadian society, we can.

May I close by drawing attention to a rather ingenious provision in this bill regarding the guaranteed income supplement. The minister referred to it. The government's intention is that the increases shall not become effective until April 1. This applies to the guaranteed income supplement, and the Leader of the Opposition made a special note of that fact. Yet I notice that the bill is ingeniously drawn in such a way that people on the guaranteed income supplement will obtain exactly the same amount of money in January, February and March, whether the bill passes or not. If the bill passes, they will get the rate provided for in the legislation as it now stands. It works out to the figure the minister mentioned.

**Mr. Monteith:** Is it not \$111.41?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It will be a bit more. They will obtain the addition of the 2 per cent escalation due in January. That is what the bill, if passed, would give them in January, February and