

Excise Tax Act and Old Age Security Act

Mr. Knowles: Is the hon. member satisfied in advance that there is no purpose? Does he not believe that if he voted with us there might be a chance to win the vote?

Mr. Olson: We know the consequences which would result if the hon. member had his way. The result would not be to the advantage of the senior citizens of this country who need this additional money in the form of the supplement as quickly as it can be delivered to them. One way to achieve this purpose is by passing the legislation.

Mr. Knowles: Has not the amendment to the Old Age Security Act already been passed? Is it not in effect whether or not this bill passes?

An hon. Member: Of course it is.

Mr. Monteith: Of course it is.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member knows it.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, as well as his colleagues sitting around him who are smiling at this point, know that while we do some pleasant things we have to do the unpleasant job of collecting the money as well. If they think they can avoid this they are going to have a rude awakening if they ever form a government, and so will the people who have been accepting this kind of garbage over the years.

Mr. Douglas: Did the hon. member not say that there is now sufficient money to last until 1969? Even if the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre were accepted there would still be enough money to last until the end of March, 1971. Therefore, how could this amendment delay payment of the supplement to the old age pension?

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: That is correct, but the leader of the New Democratic Party has completely misunderstood the argument I was trying to advance. He knows very well that this will not be done anyway. All we are doing is wasting more time because all the arguments that are now being advanced in support of sending this bill back to the committee have already been advanced previously and were not accepted at that time. All that is being asked in this amendment is that the bill go back to the committee for reconsideration of clause 1. What is more, that reconsideration will be undertaken on the basis of arguments that have already been advanced.

[Mr. Olson.]

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the hon. gentleman. I should like to ask that you cease to recognize him because obviously he should be in the Senate and the Liberals should appoint him to that body.

Mr. Olson: If the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena brings the same results as his other suggestions have, then I would propose that the Liberal party disregard it completely.

The main point of my argument is simply to plead that the house be sufficiently realistic and practical to realize that the best way to proceed to dispose of this amendment and to go on to the other business with which members of parliament are charged. We have heard all the valid arguments that can be advanced. To continue this discussion will mean a repetition of arguments we have heard before and on which the house has already decided.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that according to the rules there should only be one session of this assembly a year. This session, which has been under way since January 18, 1966, has already lasted 13 months. We are not moving ahead with the business that is before the house and the reason is that hon. members are continually invoking the rules so as to waste more time. I suggest, therefore, that the most expeditious way in which we can dispatch the business before the house is to pass third reading of the bill. I do not think the bill is perfect but we should proceed to other matters which demand the attention of the house.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify one point which the hon. member for Medicine Hat raised. He suggested that the recipients of old age security might not receive these payments retroactive to January 1 if we did not pass this bill. He knows very well that this is utter nonsense.

Mr. Olson: I never said that.

Mr. Monteith: That was the implication of what was said. He also said that third reading of the bill was a useless and fruitless exercise. Surely to goodness he has sufficient respect for the rules of the house to realize that we have to go through various procedures and that a bill cannot become law until the last step has been taken. We are still considering Bill C-268, and there is certainly nothing wrong with anything that has been said thus