

Motions for Papers

motion to indicate whether he wanted to withdraw it, have it transferred for debate or have a vote called on it. Often it is very difficult for an hon. member who puts this kind of motion to decide whether he wants to withdraw it unless he knows why the government does not want to produce the documents required. This practice has always made sense to me. At the same time it is easy to abuse the situation and to go a little too far and argue a case. I have hoped all along that there would not be argument on the part of parliamentary secretaries or ministers explaining why a motion was not acceded to by the government, but I believe that, with the general consent of hon. members, it is a helpful practice, provided there is no argument presented by the government, in indicating why a motion is refused or acceded to.

Mr. Woolliams: May I just speak to that point of order without being argumentative. If parliamentary secretaries can give reasons, surely we who are asking for the production of papers should be allowed to give our side of the story. If it is fair for one, surely it should be fair for the other. If there was not an escape in this case I have not heard of one since *A Tale of Two Cities*.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member appears to have given at least as many reasons for his case as the parliamentary secretary gave for his. I suggest to hon. members that the practice appears to be a good one, and I would hope there would be co-operation on the part of members speaking for the government and members moving such motions to continue the practice and not abuse what appears to me to be a very logical and helpful practice which we have developed over the years.

DESCRIPTION OF AREA TO BE INCORPORATED IN
SECOND NATIONAL PARK IN VAL MARIE-KILLDEER
AREA

Motion No. 17—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area which the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has asked that an order of the House do issue for a copy of a description of the area the federal government would like to see incorporated in the proposed second national park in Saskatchewan to be situated in the Val Marie-Killdeer area. The maps and papers describing this area are under active consideration and papers relating to negotiations cannot be released until these negotiations have been concluded. As no final decision has been made, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: Lots of other people see these documents. Question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—SUGGESTED ADJUSTMENT TO MEET INCREASES IN COST OF LIVING

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Ricard: Stop quacking over there.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. These 30 seconds are not being charged to the question period.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I hope that will not be charged either, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of the information we have had today that the index for food prices has gone up by one full percentage point in one month. In view of this increase is he now prepared to sponsor the adjustment of pensions to take into account fully the real changes in the cost of living? I ask this question particularly in view of the fact that a freeze has been in force for about a year so that even the most needy pensioners, those who receive the guaranteed income supplement, can receive a maximum adjustment of only about 1 per cent in the course of the year regardless of what changes take place in the cost of living.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): At \$100 a dinner it is not surprising that the food index went up, Mr. Speaker. I must say I disagree with the interpretation given by the hon. member. When the guaranteed income supplement was raised by this government to \$135 a month it was a greater increase than the cost of living increase over the years which had been covered by that increase.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, without arguing with the Prime Minister about his statement I would like to ask him whether, in view of the increase that has taken place since the change was made, and the restriction on the increase to about 1 per cent of the pensions received by those who are entitled to the guaranteed income supplement, he would make a small move at least toward justice for these people by arranging that at least the guaranteed annual supplement will be changed in line with the real increase in the cost of living?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that this matter was debated in the House. He knows that when the government brought in this modified legislation it was in order to make sure that the funds were spent more on the needy people. That is why the freeze on the \$80 was accompanied by a very substantial increase, much higher, I repeat, than the comparative increase in the cost of living, to the needy people. This increase to the needy people was also accompanied by a possible 2 per cent increase tied to the increase in the cost of living.