

*The Budget—Mr. Regier*

2. Increasing old age security and assistance payments.

3. Increasing family allowances to restore the value of their original purchasing power.

4. Establishing a national security plan, by arrangement with the provinces which will include a portable pension plan available to all residents in Canada.

Perhaps I might interject here to point out that what the minister has proposed in his budget in regard to portable pension plans does not represent the kind of portable pension plan that we have been advocating, because what he proposes will still leave without any pension plans at all, many millions of Canadians who are now without adequate pension plans.

The amendment to the amendment continues:

5. Increasing the investment in the public sector in order to increase and sustain a high rate of economic growth by providing highly essential public goods and services such as health services, including hospitals and other medical and dental facilities necessary for a comprehensive health program, low cost housing, assistance to municipalities for urban development and renewal, highways and conservation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does any hon. member desire to comment on the regularity of proposing this amendment before it is put before the house?

**Mr. Richard A. Bell (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I submit that there may be some doubt as to the regularity of the amendment, and suggest that Your Honour might like to take it under consideration before putting it to the house. I should think if the amendment simply read "This house regrets that adequate consideration has not been given to—" and then went on to enumerate the various items, it would probably be in order. The fact that it goes on to say "—and the government has failed to undertake social and economic planning necessary to stimulate the economy—" would appear to give a direction to the government in relation to the items enumerated, and if it does such it would, in my respectful submission, be out of order.

I have only had a very brief opportunity, as Your Honour realizes, to examine this proposed amendment to the amendment, and I suggest Your Honour perhaps should reserve the issue in order to have the opportunity of examining it before it is put to the house.

**Mr. Regier:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could be allowed to say a word or two in respect to the point of order raised by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Finance. I should like to call Your Honour's attention to the fact that the motion reads:

[Mr. Regier.]

This house regrets that adequate consideration has not been given and the government has failed—

I do not believe that can be interpreted as a directive to the government, but is an expression of the opinion that this house feels the government has not taken this action.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, I should just like to speak briefly to the point of order. There would, of course, be no objection to Your Honour reserving your decision without prejudice. However, I do not agree with the view taken by the parliamentary secretary. I am not now commenting on the merits of the resolution one way or another but one must support the suggestion that we should give full consideration—although I have no hesitation in saying that the increases in old age security benefits—

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Order.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):**—and family allowances are not being opposed by anything I say. Likewise, with regard to the question of portable pensions, we are in full support of the merits of those increases. What we are discussing is the—

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member should not debate the matter. He can easily reserve his comments in respect of any of these points in discussing the point of order.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is overly sensitive these days and I will overlook his interruption on that account, and because he is overly preoccupied.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** And you are overly sly.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** This motion simply asks the house to note with regret that consideration has not been given to these matters, the mere mention of which arouses the hon. gentleman. The motion goes on to say not that action should be taken but simply that the house regrets that the government has failed to increase old age pensions, family allowances and the like.

On the point of order, there would not seem to be much reason for the objection taken by the parliamentary secretary. If Your Honour feels that you wish to reserve your ruling, I do not think there will be any objection.

**Mr. Speaker:** I should like to take advantage of the opportunity of considering the amendment as the debate proceeds and to deal with it a little later. It is a comprehensive document including a great variety of specific items. I can say initially that I do not think the parliamentary secretary has