

Old Age Pensions

members I had named as having made requests for increases in the old age pension by means of speeches there were two private members on the Liberal side who had placed notices of motion on the order paper, one being the hon. member for Vancouver South and the other being the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Leduc).

However, Mr. Speaker, if you feel you must rule on the point of order that has been raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South I will yield for that purpose. May I just say that my grievance, as I stated at the beginning—and anything else I have said is by way of an attempt to underline that grievance—is that the government is stalling and delaying in announcing to parliament and to the country what are its proposals.

I am not particularly spelling out tonight what we think should be done about old age pensions. That is a matter of record. I am not particularly going into the argument as to why pensions should be increased, though I might well do so if necessary. My particular grievance—and I agree with Your Honour's statement yesterday that we should be taking up particular points of grievance, not general topics—is that despite the indications that something is going to be done, this stalling is still being carried on by the government. As I said a moment ago, I am not merely arguing that something should be done; I know something is going to be done. I am arguing that there should be an announcement soon.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I am veering away from the point of order. Does Your Honor wish to rule upon the point that has been raised?

Mr. Speaker: I have listened to the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver South and to the explanation on the same point given by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. As I see it, his grievance is the lack of action with respect to an announcement of legislation to provide for increases in the old age pension. That is pretty close to the subject matter of the notice of motion on the order paper which has to do with an increase for old age pensioners; and when the hon. member says, "I cannot move an amendment", I would remind him that it is not only when he can move an amendment that he cannot discuss a subject of which notice has been given on the order paper.

Citation 467 of *Beauchesne*, third edition, says:

... provided that the discussion and the amendment, if one is moved, shall not relate to any decision of the house during the current session ...

But let us forget about the amendment, since the hon. member is not in a position to move one. So the passage would read:

... provided that the discussion shall not relate to any decision of the house during the current session, nor to any item of the estimates, nor to any resolution to be proposed to the committee of ways and means, nor to any matter placed on or whereof notice has been given in the order paper.

What would the hon. gentleman have to say about this particular point?

Mr. Knowles: First I would say, Mr. Speaker, that though the point was raised from the Chair yesterday, no ruling was made on that occasion. Therefore I do not think any ruling along the same lines should be made today. After all, there are notices of motion on the order paper—

Mr. Byrne: You break the rules every opportunity you get.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I had better make this clear. The point I was making yesterday was completely different from that which is being presented today. The point I made yesterday was that an omnibus type of amendment was not, in my view, the type of grievance contemplated on the motion to go into supply, and I was just reciting what I thought might be the effect of moving such an omnibus type of amendment. It may, later on, put many hon. members in the position, if they had made a speech in addressing themselves to the amendment, that they would have to be repetitive when notices of motion with a different flavour, or different features, were called for debate.

I think, since latitude is always given to hon. members in discussing grievances, if the remarks which the hon. gentleman intended to make tonight were to be an appeal for increases in old age pensions he would probably be hitting right on the subject contained in the notice of motion of the hon. member for Vancouver South. But I understand his grievance is of a different character. His complaint is that the government has not announced any action at an early stage; as a matter of fact he is complaining that an announcement has not been made yet.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, you have characterized my grievance accurately, and I think you will notice that in what I have said—

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on this point of order? The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is presuming that legislation is going to be brought down, and in that way attempting to pervert the rules so he can make a speech on a motion that is already before the house. I am very anxious,