

## Division

## Messrs:

McCutcheon	Roy (Timmins)
McGrath	Roy (Laval)
McIntosh	Ryan
McKinley	Rynard
McNulty	Saltsman
McQuaid	Schumacher
Mahoney	Scott
Major	Serré
Marceau	Sharp
Marchand	Simpson
(Langelier)	Skoberg
Marchand	Skoreyko
(Kamloops-Cariboo)	Smerchanski
Marshall	Smith
Mather	(Northumberland-
Mazankowski	Miramichi)
Monteith	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Moore	Southam
Muir	Stafford
Munro	Stanbury
Murphy	Stanfield
Murta	Stewart (Marquette)
Nielsen	Stewart
Noble	(Okanagan-Kootenay)
Nystrom	St. Pierre
O'Connell	Sulatycky
Orlikow	Sullivan
Osler	Thomas
Otto	(Maisonneuve-
Ouellet	Rosemont)
Paproski	Thomas (Moncton)
Pelletier	Thompson (Red Deer)
Penner	Tolmie
Portelance	Trudeau
Pringle	Trudel
Prud'homme	Turner (London East)
Reid	Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Richard	Wahn
Richardson	Watson
Ritchie	Whelan
Roberts	Whicher
Robinson	Whitting
Rochon	Woolliams
Rock	Yewchuk—187.

• (1520)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost. The question is now on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

• (1530)

### OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

#### AMENDMENTS RESPECTING ESCALATION OF PENSIONS, RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS, INCREASE IN GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, May 16, consideration of Bill C-207, to amend the Old Age Security Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, and motion No. 5 (Mr. Rynard).

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. When the House adjourned last night, a point of order had been raised in relation to motion No. 5 standing in the name of the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard). The suggestion had been made that this motion might be difficult to accept from a procedural standpoint. I have looked at the matter and, before making a ruling, I am prepared to hear argument in relation to the point which I made last night.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest your remarks. I am afraid that Your Honour probably reread them, too, and they are probably so fresh in Your Honour's mind that it would be pointless for me to try to persuade you to take a contrary view. With regard to motion No. 5, I will not attempt to persuade Your Honour to make a ruling other than the one you indicated last night you would make. I am prepared to accept Your Honour's ruling on that. When that is disposed of, I would like to speak to amendment No. 6.

**Mr. Speaker:** If that is the disposition of the House, a ruling will be made formally. Referring hon. members to citation 246 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, I have to conclude that the motion cannot be put. I might say that I see no particular difficulty in relation to motion No. 6. Unless hon. members interpret it another way, there should be no procedural difficulty in at least having the motion put at this time. If hon. members agree, it can be put at this time.

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North)** moved:

That Bill C-207, to amend the Old Age Security Act, be amended by striking out the word "is" at lines 14 and 24, page 2 and substituting the words "shall not be less than".

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment, I am firmly of the opinion that there has been an injustice done all along the line, starting in 1967 when the old age security pension was fixed at \$75. At that time, we brought in the guaranteed income supplement. There was a 2 per cent escalator clause added at that time, providing the cost of living went up by 2 per cent or more. Nothing was added if it did not go by 2 per cent. In 1971, the old age security pension was frozen at \$80 per month, with the addition of 42 cents to the \$79.58, but without the addition of any escalator clause. As a matter of fact, the guaranteed income supplement was, and always has been, tied to an escalator clause providing the cost of living went up by 2 per cent or more.

As we review the years since 1968, we find that the cost of living has gone up by leaps and bounds. To give an example of this, in 1971 the cost of housing, which is very essential to the people we are speaking about, went up 7 per cent. The same applied to the food and the clothing they required. These are three specific items, the cost of which increased last year so these people were gypped to the tune of 5 per cent on those items alone.

We then go back over the years they have been getting a 2 per cent increase. It is my feeling that these people have been dealt with very unfairly because the difference between the 2 per cent and the actual rise in the cost of living still has not been added to the old age security pension or the guaranteed income supplement. These people are still behind the eight ball. This is something we have to look at. The government is holding back all these