and making this $30 increase an across the board improvement in the pension, I move:

"That clause 3 of Bill C-251 be amended by deleting from subsection 1 of the new section 8 being enacted thereby, the words "minus one dollar for each two full dollars of his monthly base income, being one-twelfth of his income for the preceding year", as found in lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 3 of the bill.

Then he used these words:

So as to be clear, if this amendment is accepted it would remove the test and make the $30 increase in 1967, and the 40 per cent of whatever the basic pension is after that, across the board without the kind of means test or income test that is presently in the bill.

That is exactly what he is seeking to do in the amendment before us. He knows very well what the result was. If we turn to page 11256 we find that the Chairman ruled the amendment out of order. If he was ruled out of order in committee of the whole when he tried to do this previously, then surely if we are to be consistent in our rules he would be ruled out of order again. As recorded at page 11256 of *Hansard* for December 16, the Chairman, after listening to argument as to the propriety of the amendment, gave his ruling as follows:

• (10:20 p.m.)

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reads as follows—

I shall not take the trouble to read the amendment again. The Chairman continued:

This amendment too has received the careful attention of the Chairman, and it is the opinion of the Chair that if the amendment were adopted it would have some very far-reaching effects. Indeed, one of the effects of this amendment would be to repeal the latter part of the resolution adopted by the house on December 5. It would eliminate the supplementary nature of the payments envisaged by the bill, and would substitute therefor a fixed and certain payment of 40 per cent of this pension payable to recipients under the Old Age Security Act.

The Chairman went on to explain the other reasons why the amendment was out of order, and then he said:

I recognize that this is the third amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and I regret that on this particular occasion I will have to spoil his batting average by declaring the amendment out of order.

How can the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre come before the house now and expect hon. members to believe that he has any better chance of having this amendment accepted if the bill is now referred back to the committee than he had on December 16 when he tried to move the other amendment? He knows this is nothing more nor less than a waste of time.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Olson: Certainly.

Mr. Knowles: Does he not think it would have some bearing on the situation if a majority of the house voted for this amendment? Would that not give a guide line to the committee, to which it would have to pay some attention, if he would only vote with us?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows better than I do that there is only one person who is competent to move an amendment which involves an additional charge on the treasury, and that is a member of the treasury board or of the cabinet. The hon. member has heard the minister explain that he is not prepared to accept that kind of amendment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a great waste of time. It represents the kind of political tactics we have seen in the house from time to time where some members are not interested in reaching a practical solution and finding some way of doing something effective. All they are interested in is holding up, invoking all the rules of procedure and wasting time hoping they will gain some kind of political advantage. I think it is wrong to use the senior citizens of this country as a political football.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to repeat what I said at the outset. The mover and all other members on this side of the house who intend to vote for this amendment know very well that the effect of doing so is not going to add one iota to the benefit of the old age pensioners. It is going to waste time, and I suggest that they set this political boxing aside for the time being and get on as rapidly as possible to do something positive and effective for the senior citizens of our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, tonight we have added a new phrase to the English language. We have had Santa's little helper and now, thanks to the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Olson), we have Scrooge's little helper because he, sir, is trying to exculpate the Minister of National Health