

The President of the Privy Council says that this thing has to be taken in its entirety as a package—the whole content of what was done last December. He is perfectly right, and the whole content is perfectly clear. The house took a decision against 16A but the House of Commons, by unanimous decision, made a special arrangement for the subject of time allocation to be referred to the standing committee with the authority for that committee to bring back a report recommending that something be done about it.

As I said before, and I repeat it now, if this were being done that way then the rule against dealing with something that has been dealt with in the same session would be covered by that proposition. But it is not so covered. What we have got before us is a government motion that seeks to reverse a decision made by the House of Commons unanimously last December, and it is a government notice of motion which does not have the consent of the entire House of Commons.

I have done a little homework on this as a possible point of order, but I was doing most of my research on the question as the hon. member for Peace River was speaking and I ran across certain citations which, unfortunately, I did not note, but I know they are there. They make the point that in a situation like this something like this can be done only by unanimous consent. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only possibility by which the government, as distinct from the committee of the silent member for Grenville-Carleton, can introduce a motion to reverse the decision taken last December is by unanimous consent. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot quarrel with that proposition.

This is the straitjacket the government has got itself into through the means by which it is proposing to operate. I submit that this is a clear violation of one of the oldest rules of parliament, that the government has no right to put this motion before us and, as a matter of fact, that Your Honour cannot possibly see this as a simple proposition.

I see that Your Honour is looking at the clock, as I am. My hon. friends are encouraging me to keep going. The only difficulty is that there are three late shows coming on at ten o'clock. I have the first of them and I have not had much chance to prepare for it. But it does seem to me that this is a point to which Your Honour should give consideration. I would like to look up the precise citations I was referring to a moment ago and

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion
therefore, Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[English]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SOCIAL SECURITY—INCREASED PENSIONS TO MEET COST OF LIVING

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 29 as recorded in *Hansard* at page 9214, I asked this question:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the ever-widening gap between the level of the consumer price index and the 2 per cent increases which are permitted annually to those on old age security pensions, is the government considering amending the act to permit these increases to reflect the full extent of the increases in the cost of living?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I want to come back in a moment to as strong a comment as I can make about that monosyllabic answer of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). Before I do so let me indicate what we are talking about when we refer to the ever-widening gap between the level of the consumer price index and the amount of the pensions our old age pensioners are receiving.

The present \$75 level was fixed in 1963, some six years ago. In 1965 a bill was passed which brought in the Canada Pension Plan and amended the old age security act in various respects. It provided for a cost of living increase in the old age security pension, but provided that it was to be limited to 2 per cent in any one year.

I mention these two dates, 1963 and 1965, because I think in considering the position of our pensioners, one must start from one of those two years. One must start, either from 1963 when the pension was fixed at \$75, or